

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

Edited by H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

GUSTAV GRUENBAUM

WILLIAM KURRELMEYER

JOSE ROBLES

RAYMOND D. HAVENS

KEMP MALONE

HAZELTON SPENCER

CONTENTS

	PAGE
WILSON, T. J., III.—A Bibliography of La Calprenède,	353
WILL, S. F.—The Epistolary Phrase "de vostre maison . . ." as a Polite Formula,	360
WHITTEM, A. F.—Some Data on Juan Ruiz, Archpriest of Hita,	363
THOMSON, S. H.—Oor Escutez Seinurs	368
BEALL, C. B.—A Virgilian Simile in Tasso and Chateaubriand,	370
BALL, L. F.—The Morality Theme in Book II of 'The Faerie Queene,'	371
SCHULZE, I. L.—The Maiden and Her Lamb, 'Faerie Queene,' Book I,	379
CRATHERN, A. T.—A Romanticized Version of 'Hero and Leander,'	382
HUDSON, H. H.—Notes on the Raleigh Canon,	386
MCCLOSKEY, F. H.—The Date of 'A Midsummer Night's Dream,'	389
McPEEK, J. A. S.—'Macbeth' and Munday Again,	391
HUTTON, JAMES.—Honorificabilitudinitatibus,	392
DENKINGER, EMMA M.—Minstrels and Musicians in the Registers of St. Botolph Aldgate,	395
BALL, R. H.—Massinger and the House of Pembroke,	399
STEINER, A.—Massinger's 'The Picture,' Bandello, and Hungary,	401
WAGNER, B. M.—New Verses by John Webster,	403
McMANAWAY, J. G.—The Copy for 'The Careless Lovers,'	406

REVIEWS:—

GIOVANNI RAMELLO, Hamlet, 1603. [H. D. Gray.]	410
RUTH KELSO, The Doctrine of the English Gentleman in the Sixteenth Century. [W. L. Ustick.]	412
L. H. NAYLOR, Chateaubriand and Virgil. [W. L. Schwartz.]	414
B. M. WOODBRIDGE, Le Roman Belge contemporain. [A. Schinz.]	415
E. P. ELLINGER, Thomas Chatterton, the Marvelous Boy. [H. E. Cory.]	417
T. M. CAMPBELL, German Plays of the Nineteenth Century. [P. Bruns.]	418
N. L. TORREY, Voltaire and the English Deists. [L. G. Bredvold.]	419
M. E. ROBERTSON, Abbé Prevost, <i>The Adventures of a Man of Quality</i> . [G. R. Havens.]	420

BRIEF MENTION OF F. A. PATTERSON, The Students's Milton; R. HOOPS, Der Begriff 'Romance' in der mittellenglischen und frühneuenglischen Literatur; St. J. D. SEYMOUR, Anglo-Irish Literature, 1200-1582; A. J. APP, Lancelot in English Literature; PIERCE BUTLER, Materials for the Life of Shakespeare; F. S. SMITH, The Classics in Translation,	421
---	-----

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS
BALTIMORE

Eight Numbers a Year—Single Copy (Current) Seventy-five Cents

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice.
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103,
Act of Congress of July 16, 1894.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A Monthly Publication with intermission from July to October (inclusive)

EDITED BY

H. Carrington Lancaster, Gustav Gruenbaum, W. Kurrelmeyer,
Raymond D. Havens, Kemp Malone, H. Spencer, and J. Robles

ADVISORY EDITORS

D. S. Blondheim, G. Chinard, E. Feise, J. C. French, E. Greenlaw,
R. B. Roulston, L. P. Shanks

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is \$5.00
for the United States and Mexico and \$5.50 for other countries
included in the Postal Union. Single issues, price seventy-five cents.

Contributors and Publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to the Editors of Modern Language Notes, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., indicating on the envelope whether the contribution concerns English, German, or Romance. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed return envelope. In accepting articles for publication, the editors will give preference to those submitted by subscribers to the journal. Foot-notes should be numbered continuously throughout each article; titles of books and journals should be italicized; titles of articles enclosed in quotation marks. Quotation marks are not used in verse quotations that form a paragraph. Write II, 3, not vol. II, p. 3. The following abbreviations are approved: *DNB.*, *JEGP.*, *MLN.*, *MLR.*, *MP.*, *NED.*, *PMLA.*, *PQ.*, *RR.*, *SP.* Proof and MS. should be returned to the editors with an indication of the total number of reprints desired. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to the Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Md.

UNIVERSITÉ DE FRANCE

Académie d'Aix-en-Provence

COLLÈGE DE CANNES

COURS DE VACANCES : JULY AND AUGUST

Ideal for Study and Recreation

Courses are offered for teachers and students of French in conversation, literature, civilization, philology, phonetics, methods, syntax, composition (elementary, intermediate, advanced), corrective work in pronunciation. Conversational groups limited to five members. Courses leading to M. A. and Ph. D. degrees.

The Collège de Cannes is located in a beautiful park overlooking the Mediterranean. Ideal for sports: tennis, swimming, motoring, golfing, fishing, mountain climbing. Week-end motor excursions to places of interest.

Cost including steamer, railroads, board, lodging and week-end excursions

\$350 up

For detailed information write to

Mlle Hélène Harvitt, Ph. D., Dean, 4 East 52nd Street, New York City
or Brooklyn College, 66 Court Street, Brooklyn, New York

ors
the
ript
cles
the
of
uo-
not
MP.,
an
om-

Modern Language Notes

Volume XLVI

JUNE, 1931

Number 6

A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF MANUSCRIPTS, DOCUMENTS, ARTICLES, STUDIES ETC., CONCERNING THE LIFE AND WORKS OF GAUTIER DE COSTES DE LA CALPRENÈDE ¹

It has been my purpose to include in this bibliography all known manuscripts and documents which would interest a student of La Calprenède. In the matter of books of literary history and criticism I have necessarily been forced to exercise some degree of choice; I have included those works which might rank as source-books, those which go into some detail in the discussion of this author and his work, and those which present some unusual and important, if brief, commentary upon these subjects. I have omitted the titles of general histories of literature, general manuals of criticism, feeling that it would be superfluous to mention them in a study of this sort. Although I do not enter into a catalog of the editions of the author's works, I have included here titles of several *Recueils*, *Bibliothèques*, etc., in which his poems are published or selections from his novels reprinted. Lastly, I have mentioned those works of fiction and drama, those letters and memoirs in which there are references to the author or his work, when these references seem of themselves to have a possible interest to the student, or to be valuable in establishing the position of

¹ Excluding the actual works of La Calprenède. I have in preparation a bibliography of the editions of his plays and novels which I hope to have ready for publication in a short time. I exclude also histories, novels, plays etc., which are considered sources of his work, as well as plays and novels which he may himself have influenced. Such items require more detailed proof than mere page references can provide and seem to me outside the scope of this study.

La Calprenède in the opinion of certain generations or localities. Here again choice must be exercised. As it is impossible to make a work of this kind complete, I have been as brief as I felt I could be, while including all works which, in my opinion, have a definite value for the study of this author.

MANUSCRIPTS.

1. B. N.² Carrés d'Hozier, 205, article *Costes* (extracts from documents concerning the author and his family).
2. B. N. Pièces originales, 574, article *Calprenède* (see no. 1).
3. B. N. Pièces originales, 871, article *Costes* (see no. 1).
4. B. N. Fonds français, 24723, sheet 392 (anecdotes concerning La Calprenède).
5. B. N. Fonds français, nouvelles acquisitions, 3616-3619 (fiches de Rochebillière).
6. B. N. Fonds français, nouvelles acquisitions, 4333, sheet 393 (La Calprenède and the *Polexandre* of Gomberville).
7. B. N. Fonds du Périgord, 95, sheets 22-23 (notes of the Abbé L'Espine).
8. B. N. Fonds du Périgord, 19, sheet 178 (notes of the Abbés Leydet and Prunis).
9. B. Ste. G.³ 3339, sheet 83 (notes of Rosteau concerning the novels of La Calprenède).
10. *Minutier and répertoire* of Me. Durant des Aulnois, 15 Rue Tronchet, Paris: *Acte du 6 décembre, 1648; contrat de mariage de Gautier de Costes et Magdelaine de Liée*.
11. B. A.⁴ 5419, p. 51 (Recueil Conrart, vol. x: letter from the Prince de Condé to La Calprenède, dated Feb. 17th, 1657).⁵
12. Musée Dobrée, Nantes, 643 (order of Louis XIV for payment of 2000 livres to La Calprenède).
13. Musée Dobrée, Nantes, 644 (receipt signed by La Calprenède).
14. B. N. Fonds français, 24330, sheet 83 (information concerning the stage-setting of a *Bélissaire*, probably that of La Calprenède).⁶
15. B. Ste. G., 2446, sheets 267-268 (letter to Mme de la Calprenède signed *Philadelphie*).
16. B. N. Fonds français, 32594, sheet 147 (Registres mortuaires de l'Eglise de St. Sulpice: notice of the burial of Mme de La Calprenède, dated 14th March, 1668).

² Bibliothèque Nationale.

³ Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève, Paris.

⁴ Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, Paris.

⁵ See also below under Gérard for publication of this manuscript.

⁶ See also below under Lancaster, *Mémoire*, etc., for publication of this manuscript.

PRINTED MATTER.

17. Argens, le marquis d', *Critique du siècle*, The Hague, 1755, I, 251-252.
18. Aubignac, l'abbé d', *Pratique du théâtre*, Amsterdam, 1715,⁷ I, 126, 305; II, 125. (See edition of Martino, Paris, Champion, 1927.)
19. Baudin, M., "Visage humain dans la tragédie de La Calprenède," *MLN.*, Feb., 1930.
20. Bauwens, *Tragédie française et le théâtre hollandais au XVII^e siècle*, Amsterdam, Krugt, 1921.
21. Beauchamps, G. de, *Recherches sur les théâtres de France*, Paris, 1735, II, 153 ff.
22. Beljame, A., *Le public et les hommes de lettres en Angleterre au XVIII^e siècle*, Paris and London, 1897, pp. 14, 41, 42, 465.
23. Benserade, I. de (see Tallemant des Réaux, v, 344, for *chanson*⁸ by Benserade concerning the *Cléopâtre* of La Calprenède).
24. Bernardin, M. M., *Un Précurseur de Racine, Tristan l'Hermitte*, etc., Paris, Picard, 1895.
25. Bernardin, fourth edition of *Mithridate* of Racine, Paris, Delagrave, n. d., pp. 5-11.
26. *Bibliothèque du théâtre français*, Dresden, 1768, 3 vols.
27. *Bibliothèque universelle des romans*, Paris (the two volumes dated Oct. 1780 and the first volume dated Nov. 1780).
28. Boileau-Despréaux, N., *Art Poétique*, Paris, 1674, Chant III, ll. 563-566.
29. Boileau-Despréaux, N., *Les héros de roman. Dialogue à la manière de Lucien*, Emmerick, 1688.
30. Brunetière, F., *Etudes Critiques*, Paris, 1891, p. 39 ff.
31. Bruzen de la Martinière, A., *Introduction générale à l'étude...* The Hague, 1731, pp. 184-289.
32. *Bulletin de la société historique etc., du Périgord*, 1879, p. 507; 1882, p. 502; 1886, p. 444.⁹
33. Chapelain, J., *Lettres*, ed. by Tamizey de Larroque, Paris, 1883, II, 542.
34. Chardon, H., *Vie de Rotrou mieux connue*, Paris, 1884, pp. 202-226.
35. Charlanne, *Influence française en Angleterre au XVII^e siècle*, Paris, 1906, pp. 388-393, 395, 397, 400-404, 420, 451, 453, 454.
36. Chesterfield, Lord, *Letters to his Son*, ed. by Charles Strachey, London, 1924, I, 82; II, 229.
37. *Chevraçana*, Paris, 1697, I, 18.
38. Costar, l'abbé, *Lettres*, Paris, 1658, 22 vols., I, 803.

⁷ In several instances, as here, I have not referred to the first edition of a given work. In such cases the first edition was not available in time of need and I was forced to take whatever edition came to hand.

⁸ The *chanson* mentioned here is not found in the edition of the works of Benserade published by Ch. de Sercy, Paris, 1698, the only edition to which I have had access.

⁹ Letter from La Calprenède to Mlle de Scudéry; reference to Jean de Costes, brother of the author; baptism of the author's daughter.

39. Cousin, V., *Jeunesse de Mme de Longueville*, Paris, 1853, pp. 171-172.
40. Crane, T. F., *Introduction* to an edition of *Les héros de roman* of Boileau, Boston, 1902, pp. 90-102.
41. Dacier, Mme, *Préface* to a translation of the *Odyssey*, Paris, 1716, pp. 31-48.
42. Deffand, Mme du, *Correspondance complète avec ses amis*, Paris, 1865, II, 374, 710.
43. Deffand, Mme du, *Correspondance complète avec la duchesse de Choiseul, etc.*, Paris, 1877, II, 27, 29.
44. Dencker, H., *Über die Quellen von Nathaniel Lee's Alexander the Great*, Halle a. s., C. A. Kaemmerer & Co., 1903.¹⁰
45. DuLong, G., *L'Abbé de Saint-Réal, etc.*, Paris, 1921, pp. 62-79, 157, 336.
46. Dutrait, *Etude sur la vie et le théâtre de Crébillon (1674-1762)*, Bordeaux, 1895, p. 286.
47. Duval, *Lettres curieuses, etc.*, Paris, 1725, I, 141-143.
48. *Eslite des bouts-rimez de ce temps*, Paris, 1649 (see title-page).
49. Fourgeaud-Lagrèze, *La Calprenède*, Ribérac, 1877.
50. Fournel, V., *Littérature indépendante et les écrivains oubliés*, Paris, 1862, pp. 167-205.
51. Fréron, *Année littéraire*, Amsterdam and Paris, 1754, VII, 51, 52, 62.
52. Furetière, A., *Nouvelle Allégorique*, Paris, 1658, p. 85.
53. *Gazette de France*, for 1653, pp. 340, 345.
54. Gérard, G. de, *Lettre du Prince de Condé à La Calprenède*, Bull. de la Société historique etc., du Périgord, 1879.
55. Grenailles, Fr. de, *Innocent Malheureux ou la Mort de Crispe*, Paris, 1639, *Préface*.
56. Guéret, *Carte de la cour*, Paris, 1663, p. 43.
57. Guéret, *Parnasse réformé*, Paris, 1669, pp. 111-112.
58. Guéret, *Guerre des auteurs*, Paris, 1671, pp. 176, 215.
59. Havens, G. R. and Torrey, N. L., "Voltaire's books: a selected list," *MP.*, August, 1929, p. 12.
60. Hill, H. W., *La Calprenède's Romances and the Restoration Drama*, University of Nevada Studies, II, 3 and III, 2.
61. Jacquin, l'abbé, *Entretiens sur les romans*, Paris, 1755, pp. 95, 170, 207, 269, 315.
62. Jal, *Dictionnaire etc.*, Paris, 1867, article *Calprenède*.
63. *Journal des dames*, April, 1762, p. 87.
64. *Journal encyclopédique*, July, 1778, p. 30.
65. *Journal des sçavans*, Paris, 1665, p. 91.
66. *Journal de Verdun*, August, 1749, pp. 109-110.

¹⁰ I have been unable to see this work. The bibliographical supplement to the *Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie*, 1904, lists it under *Calprevède* (sic) with a further reference to Calprevède's *Cassandra*. Mr. H. W. Hill (no. 60) proves conclusively the connection between Lee's play and La Calprenède's romance.

67. Koerting, H., *Geschichte des französischen Romans im XVII Jahrhundert*, Leipzig, 1885, I, 47, 101, 105, 242 ff., 391 ff., 419, 458 ff.; II, 50, 100, 222, 245, 273.
68. Lachèvre, F., *Bibliographie des Recueils de poésie*, Paris, 1903, II, 309.
69. La Fontaine, J. de, *Oeuvres*, Paris, 1892, IX, 22 (ballade vii).
70. La Forge, J. de, *Cercle des femmes savantes*, Paris, 1663, p. 13.
71. La Grange, V. de, *Registre etc.*, Paris, 1876, p. 52.
72. La Grange-Chancel, F., *Athénaïs*, Paris, 1700, *Préface*.
73. La Harpe, J. F. de, *Lycée, ou cours de littérature*, Paris, An VII, VII, 299.
74. Lancaster, H. C., *French tragi-comedy etc.*, Baltimore, 1907, p. 151.
75. Lancaster, H. C., *Mémoire de Mahelot, Laurent etc.*, Paris, 1920, pp. 57, 120.
76. Lancaster, H. C., "La Calprenède, dramatist," *MP.* (XVIII), 1920.
77. Lancaster, H. C., "Sidney, Galaut, La Calprenède etc.," *MLN.*, February, 1927.
78. Lancaster, H. C., *History of French dramatic literature in the seventeenth century*, Baltimore, 1929, Part I, pp. 23, 59, 328, 439, 740, Part II.
79. Lanson, G., sixth edition of *Mithridate*, of Racine, Paris, 1909, pp. 20-22.
80. Lanson, G., *Esquisse d'une histoire de la tragédie française*, Paris, Champion, 1927, pp. 47, 74, 75, 113.
81. La Porte, l'abbé de, *Ecole de littérature, etc.*, Paris, 1767, I, 221.
82. Lawton, H. W., "Notes sur Jean Baudoin et sur ses traductions de l'anglais," *Revue de Littérature Comparée*, VI, 677.
83. Le Breton, A., *Roman français au XVIIe siècle*, Paris, 1890, p. 175 ff.
84. Lefranc, Abel, "Roman français au XVIIe siècle," *Revue des Cours et Conférences*, February 8th, 1906.
85. Lenglet-Dufresnoy, N., *Usage des romans etc., avec une bibliothèque de romans*, Amsterdam, 1734, I, 258, 328 ff.; II, 64 ff.
86. Lespinasse, Mlle de, *Lettres*, Paris, 1876, p. 312.
87. Loret, J., *Muze historique*, ed. by Ch. L. Livet, Paris, 1878 (see July 12th, 1659; March 31st, 1663; October 20th, 1663).
88. Madeleine, J., edition of *La Mariane* of Tristan, Paris, 1917, p. xxix.
89. Magne, E., *Fin troublée de Tallement des Réaux*, Paris, 1922, p. 204.
90. Mairet, J., *Galanteries du duc d'Ossonne*, Paris, 1636, Epistre dédicatoire.
91. Marsan, J., edition of *Sylvie* of Mairet, Paris, 1905, p. 231.
92. Médon, P., "Gascon précurseur de Racine," *Revue des Pyrénées*, 1907, p. 63.
93. *Mercure de France*, September, 1752, p. 54.
94. (Montpensier, Mlle de) *Portraits divers*, Caen, 1659, pp. 209-216.
95. Moréri, L., *Dictionnaire historique*, Paris, 1725, article *Costes*.
96. Morillot, P., *Roman français de 1610 à nos jours*, Paris, 1893, section *La Calprenède*.

97. Mornet, D., *Sentiment de la nature*, etc., Paris, 1907, pp. 192, 303-304, 453.
98. Mornet, D., "Introduction" to an edition of *La nouvelle Héloïse*, Paris, 1925, pp. 10-11.
99. Nicéron, le Père, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire* etc., Paris, 1727-1745, vol. 37, p. 235 ff.
100. *Nouvelle bibliothèque de campagne*, Amsterdam, 1769, I, 129-166, 189-223; II, 115-151, 158-177; III, 177-212, 263-305.
101. Osborne, Dorothy, *Love letters to Sir William Temple*, London, 1903, pp. 37, 42, 57, 58, 73.
102. Palissot, C., *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de notre littérature*, Paris, 1803, I, 129.
103. Parfaict, les frères, *Histoire du théâtre français*, Amsterdam and Paris, 1745, v, 148 ff.
104. Patin, Guy, *Lettres*, Paris, 1846 (letter of December 8th, 1665).
105. *Pompe funèbre de l'auteur de Faramond*, Paris, 1663.
106. (Pont-de-Vesle) *Bibliothèque dramatique augmentée et complétée par les soins du bibliophile Jacob*, Paris, 1846, nos. 845, 846, 894.
107. Prévost, l'abbé, *Mémoires et aventures d'un homme de qualité*, Paris, 1729, II, 147.
108. Prévost, l'abbé, *Le Pour et Contre*, Paris, 1733-1740, no. 16 (see tables).
109. Pure, l'abbé de, *La Prétieuse*, Paris, 1657, III, 227.
110. *Recueil de Sercey*, etc., Paris, 1654 (see letter signed "Sacalprenet").
111. *Revue française*, August 20th, 1857 (article by Emile Colombey).
112. *Revue indépendante*, February, 1848 (article by Eugène Maron).
113. Reynaud, L., *Histoire Générale de l'influence française en Allemagne*, Paris, 1914, p. 265.
114. Richelet, P., *Les plus belles lettres françoises*, Paris, 1689, p. 83.
115. Rigal, E., *Théâtre français avant la période classique*, Paris, 1901, p. 322.
116. Rousseau, J.-J., *Oeuvres*, Paris, 1902, IX, 202.
117. Rousseau, J.-J., *Correspondance générale*, Paris, 1924, II, 17.
118. Saint-Evremond, C. de, *Oeuvres mêlées*, Amsterdam, 1706, III, 211-212.
119. Schiedermair, R., *Der Graf von Essex in der Literatur*, Kaiserslautern, 1908, pp. 37-47.
120. Segrais, J. de, *Oeuvres*, Paris, 1755, II, 128.
121. Seilhac, V. de, *Lacalprenède (sic)*, Le Montaigne, Revue de Périgord, 1836.
122. Seillière, E., *Romancier du Grand Condé, Gautier de Costes de La Calprenède*, Paris, 1921.
123. Sévigné, Mme de, *Lettres*, etc., ed. by Monmerqué, Paris, 1862 (letters of 5th, 8th, 12th, 15th of July, and 9th of August, 1671; of 18th of November, 1676; and of 16th of November, 1689).
124. Simon, Clément, "Epistolaire Tullois de l'école de Voiture etc.," *Bull. de la société des lettres* etc., de la Corrèze, 1899, pp. 497-499.

125. (Soleinne) *Bibliothèque dramatique. Catalogue rédigé par P. L. Jacob, bibliophile*, Paris, 1843-1844, nos. 1100, 1127, 1155, 1156; 1st supplement, no. 210; 2nd supplement, nos. 176, 309.¹¹
126. Somaize, B. de, *Pompe funèbre de M. Scarron*, Paris, 1660, pp. 18, 21-22.
127. Somaize, B. de, *Dictionnaire des précieuses*, ed. by Ch. L. Livet, Paris, 1856, I, 53, 63, 93, 172, 201, 206; II, 185-188.
128. Sorel, Charles, *Oeuvres diverses et discours meslez*, Paris, 1663, p. 315.
129. Sorel, Charles, *De la connaissance des bons livres*, Paris, 1671, pp. 8, 115 ff.
130. Stauber, Ritter von, *Etude sur le roman français du 17^e et du 18^e siècle*, Laibach, 1879 (see section on La Calprenède).
131. Steele, Richard, *Tender husband*, London, 1705, act I, sc. 1.
132. Steele, Richard (and Addison), *The Spectator*, London, 1718, no. 92.
133. Tallemant des Réaux, *Historiettes etc.*, ed. by Monmerqué and Paulin Paris, Paris, 1864, v, 340, 344; vi, 302-305, 382 ff; vii, 56, 62; ix, 474.
134. *Le Temps*, Paris, December 9th, 1829.
135. Tilly, le comte de, *Mémoires*, Paris, 1828, I, 158.
136. Titon du Tillet, *Parnasse françois*, Paris, 1732, p. 254.
137. Toldo, P., *Bulletin italien*, iv, 110-111.
138. Torrey, N. L. (see no. 59.).
139. Upham, A. H., *French influence in English literature etc.*, New York, Columbia University Press, 1908, pp. 390-400.
140. Valdavid, *Poésies cavalières*, Rouen, 1664, p. 64.
141. Wilson, T. J., III, Abstract of a thesis, "La Calprenède Romancier," published in *Abstracts of Dissertations for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1928.
142. Wilson, T. J., III, *Will of La Calprenède père*, *MLN.*, February, 1929.
143. Wilson, T. J., III, *Marriage contract of La Calprenède*, *MP.*, November, 1929.
144. Woelffel, *Die Reisebilder in den Romanen La Calprenèdes*, Romanisches Museum, VIII, 1915.

IN PREPARATION.

145. Hill, L. A., *The Tudors in French Drama*, dissertation, Johns Hopkins University, 1930, not yet published.
146. Lancaster, H. C., *History of French dramatic literature in the seventeenth century*, Part II.
147. Lancaster, H. C., *Le Comte d'Essex*, édition critique.

T. J. WILSON, III

New York City

¹¹ For discussion of no. 1100, see the first part of Dr. Lancaster's study, *La Calprenède dramatist* (my no. 76) and his *History of French Dramatic Literature*, p. 439.

THE EPISTOLARY PHRASE "DE VOSTRE MAISON . . ."
AS A POLITE FORMULA

Shortly before his death the poet Joachim Du Bellay addressed to his bosom friend, Jean de Morel, a letter which ended with the words: "De vostre maison au cloistre Nostre Dame, ce iii^e d'octobre 1559."¹ The phrase "De vostre maison au cloistre" also occurs in another of his letters to Morel.² Basing his conclusions upon this evidence, the eminent biographer of Du Bellay, M. Henri Chamard, surmised that Du Bellay was at that time living in a house actually owned by Morel.³ It is our belief, however, that no such literal interpretation can be placed upon the phrase "De vostre maison . . ." but that it represents merely a hospitable salutation.

Another letter to Jean de Morel from a certain Benoist ends thus: "De Paris en vostre maison le xx^e septembre 1568."⁴ If we interpret literally the statements included in Du Bellay's and Benoist's letters, Morel must have had more than one house in Paris, a circumstance which seems improbable, especially in view of a letter in which he describes his abject poverty, signed: "De vostre maison à Paris ce xxii Sept^{bre} 1571."⁵ This letter contains a desperate appeal for financial assistance from the writer to his former pupil, Henri d'Angoulême, the illegitimate son of Henri II.

There exist two other letters of the Morel family in which we hesitate to accept "De vostre maison . . ." in its literal sense. In a letter to Scévole de Sainte-Marthe, in Loudun, Morel used the ending: "De vostre maison à Paris ce xxi^e novembre 1570."⁶ Lucrèce de Morel, his daughter, concluded in a similar fashion a letter written to Madame de Bryante, in 1572.⁷

¹ Bibl. Nat., fonds latin 8589, fol. 32. Published by Pierre de Nolhac, *Lettres de Du Bellay*, Paris, 1883, p. 40.

² Munich Library, Cod. Mon. Lat. 10383, fol. 148. Published by M. de Nolhac, *RHL*, 1899, pp. 351-361.

³ *Joachim Du Bellay*, Lille, 1900, p. 390.

⁴ Bibl. Nat., fonds latin 8589, fol. 75.

⁵ Bibl. Nat., fonds latin 8589, fol. 78. To Alesme, treasurer of Henri d'Angoulême.

⁶ Bibliothèque de l'Institut, MS 290, fol. 42.

⁷ Munich Library, Cod. Mon. Lat. 10383, fol. 265.

The examples already cited⁸ lead one to suspect that the phrase "De vostre maison. . ." may have been a mere formal salutation. If we insist upon its literal exactness, we can not escape one of two questionable implications. In the event that the writers were more or less permanent tenants of the houses from which they wrote, we should find Jean de Morel in the peculiar rôle of landlord of the houses occupied by Du Bellay and Benoist while tenant of the properties belonging to Alesme, Sainte-Marthe, and Madame de Bryante. If the writers were mere visitors, we must infer that poets and humanists had a great fondness for doing their correspondence in the homes of the very friends to whom they were writing.

In the above instances, the proprietorship of the houses from which the letters were written can not be definitely settled. But the published correspondence of the Noailles family furnishes examples in which it is unquestionable that the writer was the actual owner of the house. Gérard de Saint-Marsal, "seigneur de Puydeval et de Conrots,"⁹ signed two of his letters to his first cousin, Henri de Noailles, as follows: "De vostre Conrots ce 25 d'avril 1576"¹⁰ and "De vostre Conrots, ce 15 mars 1576."¹¹ In other letters to the same man he used the salutation "De Conrots"¹² and "De Puydeval."¹³ Obviously he was writing from his own home. And M. du Breuil, or de la Breuillie, seigneur of the estate which bore the same name,¹⁴ ended a letter to Henri de

⁸ This phrase also occurs once in the correspondence of Pierre de Ronsard. In 1565 he had been granted the priory of Saint-Cosme-lez-Tours. (L. Froger, *Ronsard ecclésiastique*, Mamers, 1882, p. 32.) A few years later the encroachments of industrial developments upon his domains brought forth the poet's bitter complaints. He sought the aid of "Messieurs le Maire et les Eschevins de cette ville de Tours" and closed his letter to them with: "De votre maison de Sainct-Cosme, ce xviie juillet 1568." (*Oeuvres*, éd. Laumonier, Paris, Lemerre, 1914-1919, VII, 128.) The house of Saint-Cosme could have belonged to those officials only in a figurative sense.

⁹ Louis Paris, *Les papiers de Noailles de la Bibliothèque du Louvre*, Paris, Cabinet Historique, 1875, I, 92.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 140.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 148.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 146.

¹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 122, 128, 130, 133.

¹⁴ "Jourdain du Breuil, seigneur dudict lieu. Martin a dict qu'il est

Noailles with the words: "De vostre la Breuillie ce 20 avril 1585."¹⁵ Likewise a certain Le Burg, writing to Noailles, terminated thus: "De vostre Burg, ce dimanche 20 juillet 1585.—Le Burg."¹⁶ We have been unable to find any reference to Le Burg in contemporary documents, but it is evident that Burg is the name of the property, of which Le Burg himself would have been the most logical owner. Need we insist that "De vostre Conrots" is for Saint-Marsal, writing from his country estate, substantially the same salutation as "De vostre maison à Paris" for the inhabitant of an unnamed house in Paris? "Conrots" or "La Breuillie" indicates both the name of the property and its location.

Henri de Noailles received two other letters signed in a similar manner. We can find no record of his ever having owned an estate known as Bech, at Servières, yet a certain Dupeyron, writing of the depredations suffered by the former's château of Malesse during the religious wars, ended his letter with the words: "De vostre maison de Bech, à Servières, ce 22^e juin 1574.—Dupeyron."¹⁷ And, curiously enough, a certain Ruaud, in his letter of October 18, 1585, closed with: "De vostre *Lion d'or* de Limoges, ce jour Saint Luc."¹⁸ We have here an unquestionable reference to an old tavern of Limoges, whose modern namesake exists even today.

It seems certain, therefore, that the phrase "De vostre maison . . ." merely represents a gesture of extreme cordiality and hospitality. It is equivalent to saying: "You are always welcome in my

de la compagnie de M. Dempville [Montmorency-Damville] par quoy a esté déclaré exempt comme estant de ladicte compagnie." Cf. A. Lecler, "Rôle du ban et arrière-ban des nobles du Haut-Limousin en 1568," in the *Bulletin de la société archéologique et historique du Limousin*, 1894, XLI, 560.

¹⁵ *Papiers de Noailles*, p. 203. A reference in this letter to his service with Montmorency, indicates that this is the same Le Breuil to whom we referred in the preceding note. Although signed "La Breuillie," M. Paris lists the letter as from "Mons. du Breuil ou de la Breuillie à M. de Noailles."

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 211.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 121. Henri de Noailles, in a letter to his mother (*Ibid.*, p. 282), refers to a "Mons. de Payrans," who is "seigneur de Pech." We strongly suspect *Bech* of being identical with *Pech* and *Dupeyron* with *De Payrans*. The extreme difficulty of deciphering much of the handwriting of the sixteenth century, together with the uncertain state of orthography in that period, might well account for these variants.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 226.

house. When you visit this city, my home is yours." This very idea is implied in the Latin "hospes" and has doubtless existed among civilized people of all ages. As an epistolary salutation, it is scarcely more exaggerated than our own "Yours" etc.

But what is the immediate origin of this phrase? We had at first hoped to find here an expression akin to the Spanish "Su casa de Vd. está en la calle X" in response to the question "Where do you live?" But we have discovered no evidence of the existence of a Spanish epistolary formula similar to "De vostre maison. . ." Our efforts to find examples of this usage in Italian have been equally futile. The date of its introduction into French letters is likewise difficult to fix, but it probably disappeared by the end of the sixteenth century. To judge from the improbability that such letters were written from the homes of the persons to whom they are addressed, it would be dangerous, in the absence of supporting proof, to attempt to deduce the ownership of property from such salutations.

SAMUEL F. WILL

Yale University

SOME DATA ON JUAN RUIZ, ARCHPRIEST OF HITA

James Fitzmaurice-Kelly, in his *Historia de la Literatura española*,¹ speaking of Juan Ruiz, says:

Además, Guadalajara le hace suyo, y Francisco de Torres (m. en 1654) autor de una historia inédita de esta ciudad, pretende que Ruiz vivía aún en ella en 1415. Esta fecha (que podría ser un mero *lapsus* por 1315) está en completo desacuerdo con los hechos indiscutibles de la vida de Ruiz.

Similar references to this history of Torres have been made by others writing about Juan Ruiz, beginning with Tomás Antonio Sánchez. His statement,² which is repeated, with some slight changes, in the *Biblioteca de Autores españoles*,³ runs as follows:

En esta cancion el Arcipreste . . . se trata de anciano; y acaso habria ya fallecido el año de 1351, como se conjeturará despues. Y asi no se hace creible lo que dice Don Francisco de Torres en su *Historia MS. de*

¹ *Historia de la literatura española*, Madrid, 1926, p. 39.

² *Colección de poesías castellanas anteriores al siglo XV*, Madrid, 1790, IV, vi-vii.

³ *B. de AA. EE.*, Madrid, 1898, LVII, xxxiii.

Guadalaxara, esto es, que vivia en aquella ciudad, entonces villa, el año de 1415, á no ser que haya equivocacion por 1315, en que ciertamente vivia y podia ser poeta joven, si era ya anciano en tiempo del Arzobispo Don Gil.⁴ Esto se puede comprobar con lo que dice el mismo Torres en la citada historia, conviene á saber, que eran contemporaneos el Arcipreste, y el poeta Alonso Gonzalez de Castro. Y habiendo sido éste algo anterior, ó algun tiempo coetaneo del Arcediano de Toro, que florecio en el reynado * de Don Juan el I, se colige que nuestro Arcipreste y Alonso Gonzalez de Castro, lo fueron tambien por los años de 1315.

Sánchez's statement is thus fuller, but neither Sánchez nor any of those who refer to Torres give the text in question. At the Biblioteca Nacional in Madrid there are two copies in manuscript of the *Historia de la ciudad de Guadalaxara por Francisco de Torres, su Regidor perpetuo, año de 1647*. Of these two manuscripts, 1690 and 1689, the latter is "corregido por el mismo autor." As a matter of fact, the spelling of 1690 is often better than that of 1689. In book II, chapter 5 of Ms. 1690 and in chapter 26 of Ms. 1689 we find the following heading: "De las Segundas Cortes de Guadalaxara, y cosas sucedidas en ella hasta el año de 1437." All the events of the chapter are of the fifteenth century. The dates are given in the margin in Ms. 1689. Thus, the election of Fernando as king of Aragon in 1412 comes shortly before the paragraph in which the Archpriest of Hita figures, and the death of San Vicente Ferrer in 1419 follows shortly after it. Though Ms. 1689 is to a considerable extent a rewriting and revision of Ms. 1690, they differ only slightly in this paragraph. I give the reading of Ms. 1689 (62 recto), the "corrected" one, exactly as it stands, with the variants of Ms. 1690 (153 verso).

Por los años de 1415 hubo dos Poetas señalados en Guadalaxara (1) el uno fue Alonso Gonzalez de Castro cuya sucession (2) es hoy en los de Villariega, y Villegas (3) que tambien descenden de Pedro (4) Rodriguez de la Camara llamado de la camara (5) por ser dela (6) del Rey dñ. Alonso el Onceno (7), fue Pedro (8) Rodriguez hermano de fernan (9) Rodriguez Pecha Camarero mayor del dho Rey; el (10) segundo Poeta fue el Arzipreste de Hitta (11) que hizo (12) un gran Volumen (13) de Proverbios en verso.

Variants of Ms. 1690: (1) Guadalaxa. (2) Castro: cuya sucession (3) Villasirga y Villegas, (4) Po. (5) Camara: (6) de la (7) Don Alonso el Onceno (8) Po. (9) her. de Fernan (10) dicho Rey. El (11) Arcipreste de Hita (12) hizo (13) volumen.

⁴ Archbishop of Toledo, 1337-1367.

^{*} 1379-1390.

The date 1415 may be a mistake on the part of Torres as to the time the Archpriest of Hita was in Guadalajara, and it certainly does not fit in with what seems to be indicated in the poem itself, especially the references to Don Gil de Albornoz, who ordered the imprisonment of Juan Ruiz, since Don Gil left Spain in 1350 and died in 1367. One can hardly call it a mere "lapsus" or "equivocación" if it is meant that Torres by a slip of the pen wrote 1415 for 1315. He groups the paragraph very definitely with other events of the early fifteenth century. Again, it would hardly seem to refer to the Archpriest as "poeta joven," for he is spoken of as one who "hizo un gran Volumen de Proverbios en verso." Although we do not feel that we can accept Torres's statement, it is perhaps worth while to have it in its setting and judge it for ourselves rather than repeat what Sánchez said about it.

There is one other reference to the Archpriest in Torres which is not mentioned by Sánchez. Toward the end of the *Historia* there is given a list of famous people of Guadalajara. Under R there is no mention of Juan Ruiz. In Ms. 1689, the "corrected" one (169 recto), under "Poettas" we find: "El Arzipreste de Hitta que hizo un Gran Volumen de proverbios en Verso. Alonso Gonzalez de Castro florezio en sus poesias por los años de 1415." In Ms. 1690 (346 verso), under "A" we read: "El Arcipreste de Hita (que no he savido asta aora mas nombre suyo) hizo un gran volumen de proverbios en verso. Alonso Gonzalez de Castro floreocio en sus poesias por los años de 1415." This confession of ignorance as to the name of the Archpriest, a confession which the author leaves out in his "corrected" edition without giving us, however, any further information about him, makes us hesitate to take too seriously his date of 1415 if the person in question is really our Juan Ruiz.

On p. vii of the work of Sánchez already cited we read:

9. Siendo pues anciano Juan Ruiz en el pontificado de Don Gil, no seria de estrañar que hubiese ya fallecido el año de 1351. No faltan fundamentos para conjeturarlo. Don Baltasar Porreño, cura de Sacedon y de Corcoles, segun se intitula, escribió la *Vida del Cardenal Don Gil de Albornoz*, en un tomo en 8. que se imprimió en Cuenca, patria del Cardenal, el año 1626. En el fol. 34. dice que Don Gil hallandose en el Monasterio de San Blas de Villaviciosa, por una escritura fecha á 15^a de Junio de

*The date in Porreño is June 16, as in the Spanish translation of the document printed below.

1350,⁷ unió á dicho Monasterio ciertos prestamos, y mandó al Arcipreste de Hita, ó á su lugarteniente, le diese la posesion. Aunque Porreño nos calló el nombre del Arcipreste, creemos que en la escritura no se omitiria. Por otra bula ó escritura dada en Villanueva, diócesi de Aviñon, á 7 de Enero de 1351, hizo tambien donacion al citado Monasterio, de cierta casa y heredad que habia comprado al Arcipreste de Hita, llamado Don Pedro Fernandez, mandandole al mismo tiempo, pusiese al Monasterio en posesion de aquellas fincas.

10. De aqui se puede sospechar que el año de 1351, á 7. de Enero habria fallecido, ó entrado en otro destino el Arcipreste y poeta Juan Ruiz, y que el inmediato sucesor se llamó Pedro Fernandez. Creyendo que de estas escrituras citadas como existentes en aquel monasterio Geronimiano, podria resultar alguna noticia de nuestro poeta, he solicitado copia de ellas, ó á lo menos satisfaccion á ciertas preguntas relativas á él, pero ni mi solicitud ha tenido efecto, ni mi súplica ha merecido contestacion. Son pues muy escasas las noticias que se pueden dar de un poeta acreedor en su genero de muy singular estimacion.

So far as I know, this document of June 16 has never been printed. Villaviciosa is a small town thirty-eight kilometers from Guadalajara and five from Brihuega. Villaviciosa, or Villadeleitosa as he sometimes called it, was a favorite residence of Don Gil de Albornoz. In a church of the town there was an image of San Blas, for which the Cardinal built a hermitage adjoining his own house. In 1347 he authorized the founding of a monastery, and in 1348 he raised the hermitage of San Blas to a monastery of Augustinians. At various times he made important donations of land or houses or income to this monastery, to which he seems to have been especially devoted. After his death the monastery seems to have been neglected by the Augustinians and finally, after a good deal of controversy, it was transferred to the order of Hieronymites. The decree of "exclaustración," or secularization, of the monasteries in 1836 ended the history of the place as a monastery. To-day there exist only a few ruins. The possessions of the monastery were sold and scattered, and I have been unable to find the Latin document referred to by Sánchez. Through the kindness of a priest of Brihuega, however, my attention was called to a

⁷ By a queer twist of fate, this date, which is correct as 1350 in the Sánchez original, is printed as 1450 in the reprint of the article in the *Biblioteca de Autores españoles*, LVII, xxxiii. Sánchez thus seems, in the reprint, to make a mistake of a century, as he suspected Torres had done.

history of Brihuega⁸ which contained a Spanish translation of what is apparently the same document. No indication is given of where the Latin document is located, nor is there any mention of Juan Ruiz in connection with it.

DONACIÓN HECHA POR EL ARZOBISPO DON GIL DE ALBORNOZ AL
CONVENTO DE SAN BLAS DE VILLAVICIOSA.
(Traducido directamente del latín)

Texto castellano

Gil, por la misericordia Divina Arzobispo de Toledo, Primado de las Españas y Conciller del Reino de Castilla, para perpetua memoria, considerando que al Sacristán del Monasterio del Bienaventurado Blas de Villaviciosa, del Orden de San Agustín, cerca de Brihuega, pueden convenirle muchas cosas de Osma⁹ y de cuyos réditos el dicho Osma no obtiene gran partido, entregamos íntegra la porción de préstamos de Trijueque asignada a nuestra mesa episcopal y la mitad de los préstamos que en la Iglesia parroquial de Muduex, vacante al presente por el fallecimiento de Fernando Sánchez que al tiempo de su muerte poseía dichos préstamos, damos, unimos, anexionamos e incorporamos con todos sus derechos y pertenencias a la dicha Sacristía del Monasterio de San Blas. Y mandamos y encargamos a todos los Arciprestes de Hita y a los que ocupen su puesto, que por autoridad nuestra den posesión incorporal al mencionado Sacristán o Procurador, en las referidas porciones prestatimoniales con todos sus derechos y pertenencias que a ellas correspondan y las defiendan de cualquiera detentador o inductor, entregando al dicho Sacristán o Procurador, que lo pidiere en su nombre, con sus réditos, frutos, prevenciones, derechos y obenciones, todo íntegramente y apliquen a los que a ello se opusiesen las censuras Eclesiásticas. Dada en el pueblo de Villadeliciosa cerca de Brihuega, nuestra Diócesis, el día diez y seis de Junio del año del Señor mil trescientos cincuenta sellado con nuestro sello en testimonio de verdad.

Martín Muñoz.

(Firma del arzobispo D. Gil.)

Contrary to Sánchez's hopes, the document gives no indication as to the name of the person who held the position of Archpriest of Hita in 1350, and thus does not inform us whether Juan Ruiz was alive at that time or not.

ARTHUR F. WHITEM

Harvard University

⁸ Antonio Pareja Serrada, *Brihuega y su partido*, Guadalajara, 1916, 623-4. From this book, as well as from Porreño, *op. cit.*, I have derived some of the information given above concerning San Blas de Villaviciosa.

⁹ Osma had just come under the authority of Don Gil on January 11, 1350.

OOR ESCUTEZ SEINURS . . .

The last two folia, ff. 239-240, of vol. I of the so-called Gundulph Bible, formerly in the Sir Thomas Phillipps collection, now Huntington MS. 62, contain the poems of Alcuin (18 lines)

In hoc quinque libri retinentur codice Moysi

Ad laudem Christi propriamque in secula salutem.

and Theodulph (246 out of 250 lines)

Quicquid ab hebreo stilus atticus atque latinus

. . . . (to line 246 inclusive)

Lector, cui fulvum mentis acumen inest.

found in a number of ninth and tenth century Vulgate MS. Bibles.¹ The Vulgate text of the Gundulph Bible seems to be in a hand of the second half of the eleventh century. The poems of Alcuin and Theodulph were apparently written approximately a century later. The handwriting of these two folia is closely similar to that of facsimile 2 of Plate XI of M. Prou's *Manuel de Paléographie Latine et Française*,² dated 1183, whereas the writing of the text of the Bible would be close to that of Plate IX, facsimile 2, dated 1058.

An interesting feature of this transcription of these descriptive verses is the fact that the last four lines of Theodulph's poem (lines 247-250)³

Semine sic messor proviso plurima parvo

Grana vehit, voto fertilior cluens,

Dumque opus id cernis, relegis dum carmina nostra,

Theodulfi clemens sis memor, oro, vale!

have been omitted, and in their place there have been written six lines in Old French, in a hand that, though in general similar, is clearly later than the preceding Latin. After lines 245-246 of Theodulph's poem

¹ For MSS. and text see E. Dümmler, "Poetae Latini Aevi Carolini" (in *Mon. Ger. Hist.*, in 3 vols., Berlin, 1881), for Alcuin, I, 287; for Theodulph, I, 440-442, and text, 532-538; S. Berger, *Histoire de la Vulgate pendant les premiers Siècles du Moyen Age* (Nancy, 1893), 93, 108 sqq., 146 sqq., 192 et passim.

² 4e éd., Paris, 1924.

³ Dümmler, *op. cit.*, I, 538.

Plura referre mora est, in paucis collige multa,
Lector, cui fulvum mentis acumen inest.

there follow immediately, without pause or unexpected spacing, these six lines, ending the second column on the recto of f. 240:

Oor escutez, seinurs, que deus vus seit ami!
L chevalier e seriant, baieler e meschin;
Cest atre poure gent nel quier mie tolir.
Chancun bien fete plereit vus aoir?
Deu munt seint michiel dici qu'en puntif
E de cordres sur mer dici qu'en aufrie . . .

The contiguity of twelve-, eleven- and ten-syllable lines will be noted. Aside from a slight difference in the handwriting the only distinctive mark of the French is that in each of the six capitals, O, L, C, C, D, E, two dots, one above the other, have been placed. The scribe was ambitious for the dissemination of the subject matter contained in the codex to which he had appended this *envoi*. Knight and laborer, in every land, from East to West, from North to South were to hear this 'chancun bien fete.' His specific geography was, for a medieval poet, fairly accurate—from Mont St. Michel to the Pontus⁴ (Euxinus) and from Cordova by the Sea to Africa.

Owing to their quite obviously occasional character, these six verses may never have been copied. Throughout the two volumes of the Gundulph Bible there is not so much as a single marginal gloss in French, nor the slightest clue to the identity of a scribe or owner previous to the thirteenth century⁵ beyond the title page ascription in general terms: *Prima pars biblie per bone memorie Gundulfum Roffensem episcopum. . . .* in a hand certainly not antedating the middle of the thirteenth century. Prof. A. Langfors has not listed these verses in his *Les Incipits des Poèmes Français antérieurs au 16^e siècle*.⁶

S. HARRISON THOMSON

California Institute of Technology

⁴ Prof. E. C. Armstrong has suggested these renderings of "puntif" and "cordres sur mer."

⁵ The Bible was in the possession of the Priory of St. Andrew at Rochester in 1202, according to a catalogue of monastic MSS. of that date. See W. B. Rye in *Archaeologia Cantiana*, III, also separately printed as "A Memorial of the Priory of St. Andrew at Rochester."

⁶ Paris, 1917.

A VIRGILIAN SIMILE IN TASSO AND CHATEAUBRIAND

In reading *les Natchez* for borrowings from Tasso, I have noted an epic simile which seems to come ultimately from the *Aeneid*, perhaps more directly from the *Gerusalemme liberata*, and which has escaped the attention of Dr. L. H. Naylor in his excellent study on *Chateaubriand and Virgil*.¹ It is perhaps worth while, for the sake of completeness, to point out this further case of possible influence. The passage in question is found in *les Natchez*, III, p. 222,² and describes the jealous rage of Ondouré:

Lorsqu'un sanglier, la terreur des forêts, a découvert une laie avec son amant sauvage, excité par l'amour, le monstre hérisse ses soies, creuse la terre avec la double corne de son pied, et, blessant de ses défenses le tronc des hêtres, se cache pour fondre sur son rival: ainsi Ondouré. . . .

The passage from Virgil (*Aeneid*, XII, 103-106) deals with a bull, but there are enough similarities to justify the *rapprochement*:

mugitis veluti cum prima in proelia taurus
terrificos ciet atque irasci in cornua temptat
arboris obnixis trunco ventosque lacescit
ictibus aut sparsa ad pugnam proludit harena.³

Tasso's imitation is much closer than Chateaubriand's (*Ger. lib.*, VII, 55):

Non altramente il tauro, ove l'irriti
geloso amor co' stimoli pungenti
orribilmente mugge, e co' muggiti
gli spiriti in sé risveglia e l'ire ardenti;
e'l corno aguzza a i tronchi, e par ch'inviti
con vani colpi a la battaglia i venti;
sparge col piè l'arena, e'l suo rivale
da lunge sfida a guerra aspra e mortale.

Chateaubriand may have felt obliged to modify the passage as he did in order to show more originality in imitation than Tasso, with whose poem he was extremely familiar. Perhaps he was reserving the bull for later use (*Natchez*, x, 308 and XI, 335) and chose to substitute a boar for the sake of variety. In another pas-

¹ Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1930.

² In *Oeuvres complètes*, Paris, Garnier, n. d., T. III.

³ A similar passage is found in *Georgics*, III, 232-235. Cf. also Lucan, *Pharsalia*, II, 601 sq.

sage he changes Virgilian bulls into steeds (*Natchez*, x, 309),⁴ and in the next to the last paragraph of Book iv, beginning, "Sur les rivages du Nil ou dans les fleuves des Florides," these Protean bulls become crocodiles—or alligators, *ut libet*.

CHANDLER B. BEALL

University of Oregon

THE MORALITY THEME IN BOOK II OF
THE FAERIE QUEENE

There are several reasons for believing that Spenser may have been influenced by the morality plays. In the first place, since many of them were presented during his lifetime, it is highly probable that he saw some of them performed. Again, his "nine comedies" prove that he was interested in the dramatic form. Knowing what we do of his method, we may assume that no matter what style of play he intended to compose, he would have read and observed all the styles of drama that he could obtain. Furthermore, the evidence of Book I indicates that he was familiar with the morality form at least in its broader aspects.

In the morality play as it developed in England there is a regular formula. Man, or some abstract quality representing a human protagonist, first leads a life of virtue, is seduced by evil, despairs, repents, and is then forgiven, strengthened, and saved by Divine Grace. This, in short, is the structure of the first book of *The Faerie Queene*. The Redcrosse Knight falls into sin through his own failings, and so has to be saved from Despair by external means and be spiritually renewed by Holy Church. Obviously there is no such analogy in the story of Guyon, for he never falls from virtue, is never really in need of being saved, and is not prepared for his final adventure by religion, but by reading chronicle history. With the Palmer (Reason) for his guide, Guyon, after meeting with Amavia and the slain Mordant, sets out to destroy the enchantress Acrasia. As in the typical morality, the path is frequently beset with the forces of evil or guarded by the agents of righteousness. From Medina's house of moderation Guyon proceeds on his way, withstanding successively Furor and Occasion,

⁴ Cf. L. H. Naylor, *op. cit.* 134-135.

idle pleasure typified in Phaedria, and all the temptations of wealth and power in Mammon's Cave. While in a state of exhaustion he is physically but not spiritually despoiled by the Paynim brethren, rescued by Arthur, and instructed in the House of Alma; and is finally victorious over sensuality in its most seductive form.

The difference then, between the books of Holiness and Temperance seems to correspond roughly to the difference between the early morality plays where the salvation of the soul was the dominant theme, and those later ones in which other themes of an ethical or social nature were introduced and indeed often occupied the foremost place.¹

It may be that Spenser wished to show how the principle of Temperance could in itself be a sufficient guide to a virtuous life. This would account for the fact that in Book II there is little apparent fluctuation on the part of the hero between good and evil.

In Henry Medwell's *Nature* (ca. 1490), although the protagonist falls into error, it is notable that he decides to change his mode of life without the intervention of abstract advisers.² When Mankind asks Reason where he may find preparatives against the sins, he is told,

Thou shalt find them within thine own breast.
Of thee it must come; it must be thy deed;
For voluntary sacrifice pleaseth God best.
Thou canst not thereof have help or meed
But if this gear of thine own heart proceed.³

A late morality play, *The Trial of Treasure*, (1567) is reminiscent of Book II in structure, for the hero, Just, remains upright throughout and prevails against Lust and Inclination. It is true that the author takes care to remark that these victories were won through God's aid, but there was certainly no formal course of strengthening or purgation, and so this aid is hardly more than the gift of a sense of moral values. In the same play Just is contrasted with Lust, a character who remains vicious throughout. In *The Longer Thou Livest, the More Fool Thou Art* (1560?),

¹ For treatment of some later morality plays see Dr. Louis B. Wright, "Social Aspects of Some Belated Moralities," *Anglia*, LIV (July 1930), pp. 107-148.

² See W. Roy Mackenzie, *The English Moralities*, p. 73.

³ In John Farmer's "Lost" *Tudor Plays*, p. 122.

the hero Moros also remains depraved in spite of all attempts to reform him. This type of play, according, to Mackenzie, is due to French influence, and in a note he cites two similar French plays, *Bien Avisé*, *Mal Avisé*, and *L'Homme Juste et L'Homme Mondain*.

The old enemies of God and Man as set forth in Prudentius's *Psychomachia*; namely the World, the Flesh, and the Devil, are still present in Book II. It has been suggested that

in Mammon's Cave the World is overcome. Arthur prevails against the Devil in the person of Maleger, the captain of the vices. Guyon, in the bower of Acrasia, resists the temptations of the Flesh. The ninth canto shadows forth the struggle of the Soul within the body.⁴

This general idea is certainly correct, but I should think it open to question that Spenser had thought out the allegory in any such definite scheme as Dr. Triggs implies. If he did, however, it would not have been necessary for him to go back to early church Latin, for the same organization occurs again and again in later works, notably in the speech of the First Vexillator in *The Castle of Perseverance* (ca. 1425), and in Reason's address, with which the second part of *Nature* opens. So much for the broader outline.

One of the most emphasized sins in all morality literature is that of idleness. In Ovid's *Remedia Amoris* and later in an old French poem, *Les Echecs Amoureux*,⁵ the practical solution of the problem of idleness is active participation in the duties of this life. Lydgate wrote an original poem on the subject,⁶ in which it is called the "moder of vices alle." Again in his *Triumph of Virtue*, one is warned,

Be no sluggard, fle from ydillesse
Connyng conquer by vertuous dilligence;
Slouth of vices is cheef porteresse,
And a step-moodir to wysdam and science.

Lydgate's master, Chaucer, inveighs against idleness in the opening stanzas of *The Second Nonnes Tale*, and at greater length in the "De Accidia" section of *The Persones Tales*. Here as a remedy is offered "fortitudo." The fact that both of these are to a consider-

⁴ Lydgate, *Assembly of Gods*, ed. Triggs, EETS., extra ser., no. 69, introduction, p. lxxxv.

⁵ See E. Sieper, *Les Echecs Amoureux*, Weimar, 1898, in *Litterar-historische Forschungen*.

⁶ *A Poem Against Idleness*, Percy Society reprints, vol. 2, pp. 84 ff.

able extent translations only indicates further spreading of the idea. Earlier, in Alanus's *De Planctu Naturae*, in the description of Dame Nature's damask tunic, we find: "In its principal part man laid aside the idleness of sensuality, and by the direct guidance of reason penetrated the secrets of the heavens."⁷ In Deguileville's *Pilgrimage of the Life of Man* (translated by Lydgate), Grace Dieu tells Nature the only reason she has given her to rule over so much is because she wants to keep her from being idle,⁸ and elsewhere in the same work Nature herself declares, "I hate al maner ydelnesse." These ideas bore fruit in the morality plays, so that there is scarcely one that does not give some preachment on the matter, and to list all the instances would require more space than this paper could allow.

All this calls to mind the emphasis given the subject in Book II. To go to Phaedria's garden, Guyon has first to cross the Idle Lake, and when once there he withstands temptation largely because he is aware that such idle dalliance keeps men away from the performance of their duties. The same motif is obvious in the episode of Acrasia's bower, notably in the description of the dress of Genius, the porter,

His looser garment to the ground did fall,
And flew about his heeles in wanton wize,
Not fit for speedy pace, or manly exercize,⁹

and in the stanza on the young man whom she has seduced,

His warlike armes, the idle instruments
Of sleeping praise, were hung upon a tree,
And his brave shield, full of old monuments
Was fowly ras't, that none the signes might see.¹⁰

Uncaring he sleeps on, while he should be about his duties and feats of arms. There is too the incident of Mammon's Cave where the money god tempts Guyon with riches. Perhaps his chief objection is against the idleness that the possession of wealth might bring on:

Me ill besits, that in der-doing armes,
And honours suit my vowed dayes do spend,
Unto thy bounteous baytes, and pleasing charmes,

⁷ From the translation by D. M. Moffatt, *Yale Studies in English*, no. 36.

⁸ EETS., extra ser., no. 77, ll. 3761 ff.

⁹ II, xii, 46.

¹⁰ II, xii, 80.

With which weake men thou witchest, to attend:
 Regard of worldly mucke doth fowly blend,
 And low abase the high heroicke spright,
 That ioyes for crownes and kingdomes to contend;
 Faire shields, gay steedes, bright armes be my delight.
 Those be the riches fit for an advent'rous knight.¹¹

At least twice afterwards he reiterates the same idea,—that he has a task to perform and will not take a short-cut to success through wealth and thus be its "servile slave."

There is an interesting analogue to the Phaedria incident in *The Play of Wyt and Science* (ca. 1545). Wyt must conquer the giant Tediousness before he can marry Science, the daughter of Reason. Rather early in the quest he deserts Honest Recreation, and unlike Guyon, who is guided by the spirit of Temperance, he is unable to resist the lure of Idleness and falls down in her lap. After some very uncomfortable experiences, he is finally forgiven by Reason and is ready for a second battle with the giant. The analogy to Guyon's adventures is strengthened, I think, by the fact that Wyt is reinforced for his final struggle by three characters, Study, Diligence, and Instruction, while Spenser's hero is fortified by studying history. Let it be noted too that this play is of the practical rather than of the religious type. This preparation through study is quite in line with Lydgate's advice,

Reede in bookys of antiquyté,
 Of oold stoories be glad good thyng to heere,
 And it shal tourne to gret commodité.¹²

Further evidence that antiquity was respected for its pedagogic value is not wanting. In *The Longer Thou Livest*, Ignorance adopts the name Antiquity further to deceive Moros. In this connexion also should be mentioned such long works as *The Fall of Princes* and Thomas Occleve's *De Regimine Principum*.

To return to Mammon's Cave and its seductions of wealth and ambition, it is my impression that the evils attendant upon money, while usually mentioned as a matter of course in early works, are not emphasized to the extent they are in the later morality plays. If such is really the case, it is probably due to the changing eco-

¹¹ II, vii, 10.

¹² From "Triumph of Virtue," Percy Society reprints, vol. 2, p. 219. On the same theme, see his *Troy Book*, Prolog, lines 80 ff. (EETS., no. 97).

nomic conditions, which saw the accumulation of large fortunes, whereas earlier, when money was scarcer, the evils were almost entirely theoretical. Be that as it may, the money problem was of current interest, and there is severe criticism of the power of wealth in such plays as *The Trial of Treasure*, *The Tyde Taryeth No Man* (1576?), *The Longer Thou Livest*, and *All for Money* (1578). These titles are for the most part self-explanatory. The emphasis in nearly every case however is not upon money as an evil *per se*, but upon money ill-got and ill-used. Thus Guyon's objection that he might not receive anything until he knew that it was well-got becomes more than a mere prudish objection.¹³ Similarly, in *Nature*, Liberality urges Mankind to follow her, but warns

. that should be do
Of well-gotten goods; else it is naught,¹⁴

and in the same dialogue, she warns against being either a spendthrift or a miser, saying,

Take the midway, betwixt them two,
And flee the extremities howsoever thou do.

In similar fashion is Measure's position on the subject of great fortunes and expenditures stated in the argument with Liberty in *Magnificence* (1515?), for "Wealth without Measure wolde bere hymselfe to bolde."¹⁵

In *The Trial of Treasure*, when Inclination advises Lust to give the "apple of Paris" to Lady Treasure, he uses substantially the same arguments as does Mammon; namely, that wealth may be used as an easy way to success. He promises that if his candidate is favored,

You shall never wante the societie of Pallas;
Juno, nor yet the armipotent Mars,
Can not resiste your strengthe be they never so fearece;
And as for Venus, you shall have at pleasure,
For she is boughte and solde alwayes with Treasure;
She of her power hath whole countries conquered,
The moste noble champions by her hath been murthered.¹⁶

The terrible evils of the misuse of wealth, which are implied in

¹³ II, vii, 19.

¹⁴ Farmer, "*Lost*" *Tudor Plays*, p. 129.

¹⁵ In Ramsay's edition, EETS., extra ser., no. 98, p. 5.

¹⁶ Percy Society reprints, vol. 28, p. 25.

Inclination's harangue and which are treated in Book II, are also found clearly outlined in a passage too long to quote, in the Prologue to Lupton's *All for Money*.

The Trial of Treasure is further notable for its denunciation of ambition, through the character Just, who speaks of it as,

. that sickness incurable;
A! wicked Adrastia, thou goddes deceivable,
Thus to plucke from men the sence of their mynde,
So that no contentation therein they can finde.¹⁷

This very passage might easily have been employed to describe the "route of people . . . of every sort and nation under skye" who strive with one another to climb aloft on Philotime's golden chain. Moreover in this play, Lady Treasure appears on the stage as a beautiful woman finely dressed. Incidentally it may be recalled that Philotime was thrust out of heaven through jealousy of the gods, and in like manner in the play of *Queen Hester* (printed 1561), Ambition is turned out of his court because of Aman's jealousy. Again, the spectacle of Judas and Dives bewailing their punishments in *All for Money* is paralleled by the wretches in Spenser's Garden of Proserpina.

All for Money is not so serious in tone as *The Trial of Treasure* but the moral is, "the love of money is the root of all evil."¹⁸ Greediness and Wantonness are denounced in *The Tyde Taryeth No Man*, and numerous other instances in the contemporary literature might be adduced.

The principle of guardian angels in theory and their actual appearance in scholastic literature are common enough. One of the most striking is the "fayre Yonglyng of ful huge beaute" in Deguillville's *Pilgrimage of the Soul*.¹⁹ Probably the closest resemblance to Book II however, is to be found in *The Castle of Perseverance*. When Mankind has forsaken the path of virtue, his good angel mourns and causes Shrift to come to his aid, and later insists on his repairing to the Castle of Perseverance. Here he is strengthened by the counsels of Charity, Abstinence, Chastity, Generosity, and Industry. Belial in person leads an attack of the forces of evil but is repulsed. In both this play, then, and in

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 27.

¹⁸ Mackenzie, *The English Moralities*, p. 195.

¹⁹ See especially Capit. vii and ix. Cf. *F.Q.*, II, viii, 5.

Book II there is warning by an angel, entrenchment in a castle, instruction (not primarily religious in character), an attack by the captain of the powers of darkness, and his subsequent defeat. I do not believe that the split in the action between Guyon and Prince Arthur invalidates this as an analogue.

The castle device is conventional. It also occurs in the play of *Mary Magdalene* (ca. 1490?), where Mary's castle is besieged and taken, and Lechery and the bad angel enter. In *Nature*, Reason compares the life of man to the besieging of "a strong town or castle." The five gates of Alma's castle against which the enemies of Temperance bring their assault are discussed in *The Pilgrimage of the Life of Man*.²⁰

There are a number of minor annotations which might be suggested. For instance, similar to Guyon's binding of Furor and his subsequent loosing by Pyrochles, are in *The Trial of Treasure* Just's bridling of Inclination and Lust's liberation of him later.

It may be recalled that the porter to Acrasia's bower was called Genius, but that Spenser takes particular pains to distinguish between what he actually represents and the real, beneficent power Genius.²¹ This device is well known in the morality play, and as Professor Mackenzie remarks, "In almost every English Morality the Vices resort to the trick of changing their names for added effectiveness." In *The Longer Thou Livest* Idleness becomes known as Pastime, Incontinence as Pleasure, and Wrath as Manhood; in *Nature* Sensuality remarks that Envy, Wrath, Gluttony, Covetise, Sloth and Lechery have changed their names to fool Mankind;²² in *The Tyde taryeth No Man Hurtful-helpe*, Paynted-profitte, and Fayned-furtherance become known respectively as Helpe, Profite, and Furtherance.

In *The Faerie Queene*, when, "Distempred through misrule and passions bace," Man has fallen from his high place, he becomes like any one of various animals, as portrayed in the beasts which have been enchanted by the sorceress Acrasia. Against this very thing Reason warns in *The Pilgrimage of the Life of Man*:

Ye shal be men & ellys nauht;
And yiff the trouthe be wel sauht,
Whan that I am fro yow gon,

²⁰ EETS., extra ser., no. 77, lines 4390 ff.

²¹ II, xii, 47.

²² Farmer, "Lost" Tudor Plays, p. 81.

Ye may avaunte (& that a-noon,)
 That ye be (thys, no fable)
 Bestys & unresownable.²³

In Medwell's *Nature* Reason tells of the effects of Sensuality upon man:

For sensuality, in very deed,
 Is but a mean which causeth him to fall
 Into much folly, and maketh him bestial;
 So that there is no difference, in that at the least,
 Betwixt man and an unreasonable beast.²⁴

Elaborations of the idea occur repeatedly throughout the play.

In *Nature* the character, Shamefacedness, who offers to help Mankind whenever he asks for it vaguely suggests Alma in *The Faerie Queene*. It may perhaps be worth noting that in the play, *Albion, Knight* (ca. 1560), the hero represents in addition to his moral qualities the spirit of England, apparently in somewhat the same way as Spenser's characters often do, and specifically Prince Arthur.

It may be seen, then, that there are in the literature under examination many ideas, analogues, and hints which are to be found in Book II. Many of these occur also in classical writings, but it seems more likely that Spenser received the chief imprint from late scholastic works and, since we know that he was interested in the dramatic form, from the morality plays in particular. Finally, it is not necessary to postulate any direct sources, since most of the features are conventional.

LEWIS F. BALL

Baltimore, Maryland

THE MAIDEN AND HER LAMB, *FAERIE QUEENE*, BOOK I

Professor Greenlaw, in a note on "Una and her Lamb,"¹ considers the suggestion of Messrs. Padelford and O'Connor,² that Spenser found his original of Una and her lamb in old versions of the Saint George legend in which the king's daughter is sacrificed along with a sheep. Professor Greenlaw confirms the view

²³ EETS., extra ser., no. 77, p. 55, lines 2019 ff.

²⁴ Farmer, "Lost" Tudor Plays, p. 52.

¹ MLN., XLII (1927), 515-516.

² SP., XXIII (1926), 159.

"that Spenser was following the ancient legend rather than contriving a subtle allegory of truth and innocence." But he points out that there is no necessity for postulating any one literary source for Spenser's use of the legend and cites two fifteenth century pageants which provide all the elements of the story as used by Spenser and avoid the transformation of the sheep into the lamb as required by the sources suggested by Messrs. Padel-ford and O'Connor. My purpose is simply to cite additional instances of the occurrence of the legend to illustrate its wide dissemination and to show that the maiden and the lamb frequently appeared together.

When Edward IV visited Coventry in 1474 there were numerous pageants presented in his honor.

Also upon the Condite in the Crosse Chepyng was seint George armed and kynges doughtr knelyng afore him with a lambe and the fader & the moder beyng in a toure a boven beholdyng seint George savyng their doughtr from the dragon.³

Nearly all of the necessary elements reappear in the Saint George pageant of Edward VI's coronation procession. At the little conduit in Cheap "was sett a stage, whereupon was Seint George on Horsebacke in Compleat Harnes, with his Page in Harnes also, holding his Speare and Shield, and a faire Maiden holding a Lamb in a string."⁴ While the above account appears to indicate a defective representation of the legend, the elements of real significance to us, the maiden and her lamb, do appear.⁵

There are numerous instances of the occurrence of the legend exclusive of the pageant. George Scharf⁶ mentions a votive painting of Saint George, mounted on a brown charger, about to take the last blow at the dragon which has already been wounded through the neck. Near the saint stands a princess "with a lamb

³ Thomas Sharp, *A dissertation on the pageants or dramatic mysteries anciently performed at Coventry*, London, 1825, p. 154. Also cited in EETS., E. S. No. 87; Robert Withington, *English Pageantry*, 1918, p. 154.

⁴ John Leland, *Collectanea*, London, 1770, iv, 319.

⁵ Other apparently defective representations of the legend in the form of pageants which I have not cited because the accounts do not include both the maiden and the lamb may be found in Leland, *op. cit.*, iv, 197; Withington, *English Pageantry*, p. 112; *The Diary of Henry Machyn*, ed. J. G. Nichols, Camden Soc. Pub., 1847-8, p. 201.

⁶ *Archaeologia*, XLIX, 244.

in a string." In the foreground kneel Henry VII, the Queen, and their children. This painting, according to Scharf, was probably designed for the altar of some chapel of Saint George. In addition to this painting the author cites various representations of the legend as depicted upon armor, coins, woodcuts, statuary, and tapestries. Joseph R. Smith⁷ prints the title of "A most excellent ballad of St. George for England, and the King's daughter whom he delivered from Death, and how he slew a mighty dragon." Possibly this may be the poem, "Saint George for England," (printed in 1601 by Richard Vennard in *The Right Way to Heaven*), which begins as follows:

A Virgin Princesse and a gentle Lambe,
Doomb'd both to death to gorge this ugly beast:
This valiant victor like a Souldier came,
And of his owne accord, without request:
With never daunted spirit the Fiend assail'd,
Preserv'd the Princess and the Monster quail'd.

The piece goes on to compare Saint George's victory over the dragon and his preservation of the princess with Christ's victory over the devil and his preservation of the church. The closing stanzas laud Montjoy as Saint George's knight and urge him to

Quell that Hell's shape of divellish proud Tirone . . .
That our deere Princesse and hir land be safe.

Vennard's book was dedicated to the Queen; and this use of the legend, with its direct reference to her Majesty and to political events, is not far removed from Spenser in spirit.

The foregoing paragraphs offer, I believe, sufficient evidence to show the wide diffusion of the legend in one form or another. Therefore, as Professor Greenlaw has pointed out, it is impossible to cite any one occurrence of the story as Spenser's source. Furthermore, several of the instances I have cited include both the maiden and the lamb. If some particular occurrence of the legend is to be postulated as the poet's source, why is it necessary to select one that requires the transformation of the sheep into the lamb?

IVAN L. SCHULZE

Texas State College for Women

⁷ *Catalogue of Ancient English Ballads*, London, 1856.

A ROMANTICIZED VERSION OF *HERO AND LEANDER*

In *MLN.* for June, 1929, G. P. Shannon calls attention to Henry Petowe's poem, "The Second Part of *Hero and Leander* containyng their further Fortunes," which was published in 1598 as a continuation of Marlowe's unfinished work.¹ Mr. Shannon describes the poem as a weak piece of rhetoric, full of "such claptrap as a tournament, a knight in disguise, a cruel duke, happy wedding bells and final metamorphosis into pine trees."

As poetry Petowe's effort may be weak, but as an attempt to retell the old story in terms of a mediaeval romance it is interesting and significant. It is well known that long after mediaeval romance fell into disrepute in English literary society its materials continued to interest the lower classes. Petowe's deliberate use of stereotyped romance situations to enhance the popular appeal of his poem is an early illustration of this interest.

But if Petowe was the first to borrow from romance to adorn the Hero and Leander story he was not the last. As late as the eighteenth century the same device was employed by an unknown chapbook author to satisfy the literary tastes of the populace for whom the chapbooks were designed. It is obvious from a comparison of the two romanticized versions that he was not influenced by Petowe's poem. Probably, since we have no evidence that this was ever reprinted before 1850, it was not even known to him. I have not been able to find a source for the chapbook version or to trace it back earlier than the first quarter of the eighteenth century, but present it as an interesting illustration of the presence of the elements of mediaeval romance in some of the byways of eighteenth century literature.

There are five chapbook editions of the Hero and Leander story in the Harvard University collection, all based on the same original and varying from each other only in slight details. My study is based on these copies, for I have not been able to examine those listed in the British Museum Catalogue. Since, however, Harvard possesses a greater number of different editions and a copy apparently older than any noted in the English catalogue, the items here

¹ Bodleian Library. Excerpts of poem are to be found in Dyce's edition of Marlowe's works, 1850, vol. III.

listed probably give a fairly accurate idea of the chapbook treatment of the Hero and Leander story.

A. "The Famous and Renowned history of the unfortunate but noble lovers, Hero and Leander. Printed by E. M. for T. Norris at the Looking Glass on London Bridge."²

This is the only one of the chapbooks that I have been able to date with any certainty. Thomas Norris's activities as a London book-seller extended from 1695-1732, the year of his death.³ Since he moved his shop to London Bridge in 1711, our chapbook must have been printed after that year and before 1732. An address to the reader signed J. S. (Shirley?) tells us that the author has drawn the story "into a small compass, though very much to the purpose, containing much variety and Delight, so that it may be accounted the Perfection of History, dressed in a method that cannot but please."

In this romanticized version, Hero is no longer a priestess of Venus but lives at the court of her father, Armilius, prince of Sestos. Leander, marching through the city in a triumphal procession on his way to Abydos, sees her, falls in love with her, but does not learn who she is. Unable to forget her, he returns to Sestos secretly. Upon his arrival he rescues Armilius and his daughter from a band of "pirates" who have attacked them in the forest. Leander recognizes Hero as his love, but rides away without disclosing his identity or his love for her. In gratitude for his rescue, Armilius plans a tournament to which in true romance style Leander comes in disguise, bearing on his shield a heart shot through with sun's rays, and the sentiment, "She for whom I suffer is ignorant of my love." He overthrows the Prince of Persepolis, to whom her father plans to wed Hero and who before Leander's arrival had been ready to claim the prize, and so wins the diamond-studded coronet and at the same time a jealous rival. The prize he gives to Hero, concealing in it a letter declaring his love, but leaves the court without disclosing his name. Altemansor, the jealous prince, sends twelve of his followers to murder him, but Leander slays eleven of them and spares the twelfth only that he may report to his master the failure of the plot.

² *Catalogue of English and American Chapbooks and Broad-sides in Harvard Library*, 1906, no. 496.

³ *Dictionary of Booksellers and Printers, 1668-1725*, H. R. Plomer, 1922.

When Hero learns that this handsome suitor is Leander, with whom she has secretly been in love since the day of the procession, she speedily sends a letter to him by Amoressa, her nurse and confidante. On the way Amoressa is pursued by a fearful monster, but Leander is resting nearby and saves her after a terrific struggle with the beast. Amoressa delivers the letter and promises to help the lovers, but counsels secrecy because of Altemansor's great power.

In the meantime Armilius, ignorant of Hero's attachment, proposes Altemansor for her husband, and refuses to listen to her protests. Anxious letters between the lovers follow, until Leander finally reveals himself to Armilius as his rescuer and asks for Hero's hand. Armilius rejoices to find his gallant hero but considers himself bound by his promise to Altemansor. The latter, fearful lest his rival should be successful, attempts to poison him. Failing in this, he attacks Leander by night, but is himself killed in the scuffle. There is a moment of hope for the lovers, but it disappears when Armilius promises Hero to the slain prince's brother, and imprisons her to make flight impossible. With the help of Amoressa, however, Leander visits her and persuades her to flee with him.

At this point the author returns to the familiar form of the story: Leander brings the boat but loses it in the tempest; unable to find another and unwilling to disappoint Hero, he swims after it and is drowned. Hero, made desperate by the sight of his body floating beneath her window, jumps into the sea to join him.

B. "Hero and Leander or the Unfortunate Lovers: An Ancient and Esteemed Romance. To which is added Leander's Epistle to Hero and Hero's answer. Both translated from Ovid by N. Tate, Esq. Printed for A. Cleugh, no. 23 Ratcliff Highway; and C. Stalker, Stationers' Court, Ludgate Street. Price Sixpence."⁴

This is by far the longest of the chapbook forms, containing additional letters between the lovers as well as between Leander and Armilius, long soliloquies, and a lengthy description of the beast that pursues the nurse. Aside from these rather wordy additions, the only change in detail is that the nurse is called Amphyllia throughout the story.⁵ Since the names of Cleugh and Stalker

⁴ Harvard Catalogue, No. 495.

⁵ In *A* the nurse was called Amphyllia at first, but was later referred to as Amoressa.

do not appear in Plomer's Dictionary or in any earlier one, and since the advertisement, on the cover, of Pope's "Essay on Man" gives us 1733 as a *terminus a quo* for this copy at least,⁶ the edition is probably a later and much embroidered version of A.

C. "The famous history of the two unfortunate lovers, Hero and Leander. Glasgow, Printed for the Booksellers."⁷

The similarity of phrasing in A and C make it apparent that C was based on A, although it is a somewhat condensed form and was probably published later. The nurse is called Amoressa throughout the story.

D. "The Famous History of the two Unfortunate Lovers Leander and Hero. Printed for the Booksellers."⁸

This small paper pamphlet is very like C and was probably an even later edition based directly on C. Some slight changes in phrasing, however, and the fact that in D the nurse is first Amoressa and then Amphilia indicate that D is not a reprint of C.

E. "The Famous History of the two Unfortunate Lovers Hero and Leander who Ended their Lives in the Sea for each other. Printed and sold in Aldermay Churchyard, London."⁹

This is an example of the extreme condensation which was possible in a chapbook. A great many of the details given in the other editions are omitted: no conversations are recorded, the letters are abbreviated or omitted altogether, and no mention is made of Hero's marriage to Altemansor's brother, of the rope-ladder by which Leander made his final visit to Hero, or of Leander's vision of the mermaids with their warning song.

The exact dates and relationship of these five editions, only a few, probably, of many editions of a once popular chapbook are relatively unimportant. Their literary value and influence are negligible. Their importance lies in showing that an author of the eighteenth century strove to please his public by decking Hero and Leander in the worn trappings of mediaeval romance.

ALICE T. CRATHERN

Western Reserve University

⁶ The *Essay on Man* was published in 1733.

⁷ Harvard Catalogue, No. 497.

⁸ Kittredge Collection of Chapbooks in Harvard Library.

⁹ Harvard Catalogue, No. 498.

NOTES ON THE RALEGH CANON

In a review of Miss Agnes M. C. Latham's edition of Raleigh's poems,¹ I some time ago pointed out the likelihood that certain poems printed in *The Phoenix Nest*, 1593, and standing in juxtaposition with those known to be by Raleigh, might well also be Raleigh's. I am now able to present external evidence in reinforcement of this suggestion. The evidence comes from Harleian Manuscript 7392, and with it some additional light upon the Raleigh canon.

1. At fol. 36v of the manuscript is to be found this version of a poem which appears in *The Phoenix Nest*² in close proximity to those which have been authenticated as Raleigh's:

Would I wer changde, into that goulden shower,
 That so devinely stremed from the skyes,
 To fall in droppes vpon the dainty fflower,
 Wher in her bed, she solitary lyes.
 Then would I hope such showres, as richly shine,
 Would pierce more depe, then thes wast teares of mine.
 Or would I were, yt plumed swan, snow whight,
 Vnder whose form, was hidden heavenly power,
 Then in that river wold I most delight,
 Whose waves do beate, against her stately bower.
 And on those bankes, so tvne my dyinge songe,
 That her deafe eares, should thinke my plaint to longe
 Els wold I wer Narcissus, that sweete Boy,
 And she herself the ffontayne, Cristall cleere,
 Who ravisht with the Pride of his own Joy,
 Drenched his limmes, wth gazing over neere.
 So should I bringe my Sowle to happy reste
 To end my Lyfe, in that I loved beste.

FINIS. RA.

Let me say at once, concerning the subscription, that in this manuscript "RA" is similarly placed after copies of two poems which Miss Latham ascribes to Raleigh on other evidence; and that "SYD" and "Sr P SY" are used to designate Sidney, and "EL" and "ELI" to designate Queen Elizabeth.

2. If we may place trust in the ascriptions of the collector of

¹ *MLN.*, XLV, 200.

² Edition of T. Park, *Heliconia* (1815), II, 103.

the manuscript, we may assign to Raleigh not only the poem I have quoted, and the version of it appearing in *The Phoenix Nest*, but also the following poem which appears on fol. 36r:

Sweete ar the thoughtes, wher Hope persuadeth Happe,
 Great ar the Joyes, wher Harte obtaynes requeste,
 Dainty the lyfe, nurst still in ffortunes lappe
 Much is the ease, wher troubled mindes finde reste.
 These ar the fruictes, that valure doth advaunce
 And cuts of Dread, by Hope of happy chaunce.
 Thus Hope brings Hap; but to the worthy wight,
 Thus Pleasure comes; but after hard assay,
 Thus ffortune yelds, in manger oft for spight,
 Thus happy state is none without delay.
 Then must I needes advaunce my self by Skyll,
 *to And lyve, *and serve, in hope of yur goodwyll.

FINIS RA.

This so far as I know, has never been previously printed. It is a slight enough addition to the Raleigh canon, but I see no reason for not accepting it. In style it accords with the early poems of Raleigh, such as his commendatory verses before *The Steel Glas*, 1576 (beginning, "Swete were the sauce would please ech kind of tast"), and the poems quoted from in *The Arte of English Poesie*, 1589. It should also be compared with the poem in *The Paradise of Dainty Devices*, 1576, beginning, "Swete were the ioyes, that both might like and last," which was signed "W. R." in the editions of 1578 and 1580, though ascribed differently in the first and in several subsequent editions.

3. The manuscript also gives additional strength to one of Miss Latham's ascriptions, namely that of *A Farewell to False Love*, consisting of thirty lines which begin, "Farewell false loue, the oracle of lyes," printed without author's name in Byrd's *Psalmes, Sonets and songes*, 1588, in Thomas Deloney's *The Garland of Good Will*, 1631 etc., and in *Le Prince d'Amour*, 1660, but according to Bullen assigned to Raleigh in a manuscript formerly in the possession of Mr. Bertram Dobell.³ The poem, substantially in the version printed by Miss Latham from Byrd and from Rawlinson Poetry Manuscript 85, where again it is anonymous, appears in the

³ That this is not the present manuscript is proved, if proof be needed, by the fact that in Dobell's manuscript the poem was designated as a reply to one by Sir Thomas Heneage.

Harleian manuscript under discussion at fol. 37r, with the subscription "FINIS. RA."

The same subscription follows a copy, at fol. 36v, of the eighteen lines beginning, "Callinge to minde, mine ey went longe abowte," which appeared in *The Phoenix Nest* without its author's name, but which for long has been assigned to Raleigh on the evidence of Cotgrave's *Wits Interpreter*, 1655, several manuscripts, and a quotation from it in *The Arte of English Poesie*. For the sake of completeness I may add that one other poem by Raleigh (one which also appeared in *The Phoenix Nest*) is copied in the manuscript, twenty-four lines beginning, "Her fface, her Tonge, her Wytte,"⁴ at fol. 66v; and is subscribed "Raley" but in a different hand from that of the original transcriber.

The trustworthiness of the ascriptions in the manuscript under discussion is enhanced by the facts I have just recorded; namely, that in three cases poems already judged upon other evidence to be Raleigh's are ascribed to him, and that no poem is ascribed to him that is known to be another's. I may say that a rather hurried examination revealed no false ascriptions to other authors among the many poems of the manuscript. Scribbling at the end of the manuscript suggests that Robert Allott was either the compiler or an early owner.

4. Finally, I wish to call attention to the following passage appearing on p. 16 of William Vaughan's *The Golden Fleece*, 1626:

For this cause I minded to lay aside my *Melodie*, one of my chiefest Receipts, to restore *mad* men to their wits, in respect of these thanklesse times; and thus to lament my doubtfull disaster, as Sir *Walter Raleigh* did to our late *Queene Anne* of happy memory:

*My broken pipes shall on the willow hang,
Like those, which on the Babylonian bankes,
These ioyes foredone, their present sorrow sang;
These times to worth yeelding but frozen thanks.*⁵

From the introductory sentence, one cannot be sure whether Vaughan is quoting Raleigh or imitating him. These lines do not occur in *S. W. Raghlies Petition to the Queen*, 1618, or in the

⁴ Miss Latham's edition, p. 38; see her notes for evidence of Raleigh's authorship.

⁵ In the third line of the quatrain, "These" is doubtless a printer's error for "Their."

conjectural first draft of that petition discovered by Miss Latham; and if they are Raleigh's then they represent an entirely different address to the Queen, as the poems just mentioned are in three-line stanzas. If Vaughan was imitating Raleigh, he did so skilfully; the quatrain would fit perfectly into the eleventh book of *Cynthia*. The third line seems to echo the first line of the twelfth (fragmentary) book.

My dayes delights, my springtyme ioyes fordvnn.

My suggestion is that the four lines are quoted by Vaughan from a poem by Raleigh, addressed to Queen Anne, in which the unfortunate poet adopted the style and stanza-form, and perhaps utilized some phrases, of his unfinished books of *Cynthia*.

HOYT H. HUDSON

Princeton University

THE DATE OF A MIDSUMMER NIGHT'S DREAM

The seventh of the extant Elizabethan poetical miscellanies, *The Phoenix Nest*, was published in 1593. The only known complete copy of *The Arbour of Amorous Devices*, in the Huntington Library, is dated 1597. This is now recognized as a miscellany, although for a long time, because of the skill of Richard Jones, its printer, in drawing a red herring across the trail, it was erroneously ascribed to Nicholas Breton. It contains one of the most lively and quaint of all Jones's "Epistles to the Reader." In it he says: "and had not the Phenix preuented me of some of the best stuffe she furnisht her nest with of late, this Arbour had been somewhat the more handsomer trimmed vp." This passage suggests that an edition of *The Arbour*, now lost, actually was issued in 1594. The allusion to *The Phoenix Nest* seems to indicate that "R. S." and his printer, John Jackson, anticipated Jones in printing some of the verses there included. Jones would hardly have made such a statement if the "preuention" had occurred four years earlier; at least he would not have used the term "of late." The preface postulates almost definitely an edition dated 1594, not extant.

The third poem of *The Arbour*, entitled "A poem of a Mayde forsaken,"¹ contains a passage which, because of its striking simi-

¹ Upon the basis of internal evidence, I conjecture that this poem was

larity to a part of Bottom's song in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, has often been noticed as an allusion to Shakespeare. It begins with the conventional situation, "as late I lay within an arbour sweet." The poet hears a maid lamenting "Cupid slights" which "kill the heart." She calls upon the woods, rocks, birds, and beasts to witness her faithfulness in death. The poem concludes:

The red breast then did seeme to be the Clarke.
And shrowded her vnder the mosse so greene,
He calles the birds each one to sing aparte:
A sight full strange and wotthy (*sic*) to be seene,

The Larke, the Thrush and Nightingale,
The Linnet sweete, and eke the Turtles true,
The chattering Pie, the Iay, and eke the Quaile,
The Thrustle-Cock that was so blacke of hewe.

All these did sing the prayse of her true heart,
And mourned her death with dolefull musick sòund:
Each one digged earth, and plyed so their part,
Till that she was close closed vnder ground.

The entire poem has the unmistakable ring of the broadside ballad. The second of the quoted stanzas at once suggests Bottom's song in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, III, i:

The Woosel cocke, so blacke of hew
With Orange-tawny bill.
The Throstle, with his note so true
The Wren and little quill

Tita. What Angell wakes me from my flowry bed?

Numerous scholars² have noted the similarity of these passages as an allusion by Breton to Shakespeare. The author of the present poem wrote in all seriousness; his poem is intended to be most pathetic. It is not likely that he would introduce into it a passage

written by Richard Edwards. The fifth poem in *The Arbour*, "A Ladies complaint for the losse of her loue", was recently reprinted by Professor Hyder E. Rollins (*RES.*, iv, 205) from British Museum Add. MS 26737, f. 106v, where it appears as "An Elegie on the death of a Sweetheart", signed "The songe of Emelye per Edwardes". The style of "The Mayde forsaken" as well as of the first and second poems of the miscellany is almost unmistakably the same. I conjecture that a manuscript of a number of Richard Edwards's ballads fell into Jones's hands and was utilized to form the first part of *The Arbour*.

² Among them Steevens, Halliwell-Phillipps, Furness, and Ingleby.

heard in the theatre on the lips of the stupid clown, Bottom. On the other hand, it is quite probable that the similarity in the two passages represents an allusion by Shakespeare to the present ballad. To heighten the contrast between the dainty Titania's idyllic lines and the coarse bellowing of the stupid Bottom, he needed a stupid stanza from a stupid street-song, preferably one at the time known well enough to be recognizable to the audience. What more apt for the purpose than a garbled version of the "Mayde forsaken"?

If the hypothesis is accepted, some light is thrown upon the troublesome question of the date of composition of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. Scholars' guesses have ranged from 1589 to 1598, the date of Mere's mention of it. Of course, the ballad may have been current before Jones printed it in *The Arbour*; but it is reasonable to infer that its inclusion in a published miscellany would add to its popularity and make it generally better known. Granted the acceptance of the hypothesis that there was published an earlier edition of *The Arbour*, the evidence furnished by these significant passages is in strong support of those who contend for c. 1595 as the date of composition of Shakespeare's *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, on the ground of the supposed allusions in the play to the storms, pestilence, and dearth of the winter of 1594, and of its supposed composition to grace the nuptials of the Earl of Derby and the Lady Elizabeth De Vere.

FRANK HOWLAND McCLOSKEY

New York University

MACBETH AND MUNDY AGAIN

Could Shakspeare have been influenced by Anthony Mundy in his passages on darkness in *Macbeth*? In the *Downfall of Robert, Earl of Huntington*,¹ the following lines,

Muffle the eye of day,
Ye gloomy clouds (and darker than my deeds
That darker be than pitchy sable night)
Muster together on these high topped trees,
That not a spark of light thorough their sprays
May hinder what I mean to execute—

¹ Listed by Henslowe in 1597-1598 and printed in 1601. See Dodsley's *Old English Plays*, VIII, p. 190.

invite comparison with

Come, seeling night,
Scarf up the tender eye of pitiful day,
(III, ii, 46-47)

and

Come, thick night,
And pall thee in the dunnest smoke of hell,
That my keen knife see not the wound it makes,
Nor heaven peep through the blanket of the dark,
To cry 'hold, hold!'
(I, v, 48-52)

That Shakspeare knew this play has been fairly well established; and as Miss Celeste Turner has noted,² it may have furnished him at least one other memorable image.

JAMES A. S. MCPEEK

Cambridge, Massachusetts

HONORIFICABILITUDINITATIBUS

This 'word' has interested commentators on *Love's Labor's Lost* 5. 1. 44, and various earlier occurrences of it have been exhibited as likely sources of that passage. The accumulation of these at least serves to show that the term was a commonplace; and, such being the case, it is perhaps vain to look for a definite origin of Shakespeare's knowledge of it. Nash has the expression (*Lenten Stufte*, 1599, in *Works*, ed. by McKerrow, 3. 176), and Marston (*Dutch Courtezan*, 1605, Act 5, in *Works*, ed. by Halliwell, 2. 182). 'Wie Shakespeare das Wort kennen lernte,' says A.

² Miss Turner suggests that Shakspeare may have united one line from the *Downfall of Robert, Earl of Huntington* (Dodsley, p. 173),

"Making the green sea red with Pagan blood,"

with another from the sequel to this play, *The Death of Robert, Earl of Huntington* (Dodsley, p. 268),

"The multitudes of seas dyed red with blood,"

in composing the lines,

"The multitudinous seas incarnadine,
Making the green one red." (II, ii, 62-63)

See *University of California Publications in English*, II, No. 1, 1928, *Anthony Mundy, An Elizabethan Man of Letters*, p. 118.

von Mauntz (*Shak. Jahrb.* 33. 273), 'darüber fehlt noch jeder sichere Anhalt. Der Möglichkeiten sind gar viele. Die wahrscheinlichste scheint mir die zu sein, daß englische Gelehrte jener Zeit de Balbi's *Catholicon* kannten, und unter Benutzung desselben Vorträge gehalten, oder Unterricht erteilt haben, in welchem Falle das 13 silbige Wortungeheur . . . in weiteren Kreisen bekannt werden konnte.'¹

A more obvious parallel, not before cited, I think, is the following, to be found in Erasmus, *Adagia* 3. 2. 69 (Hamaxiaea): 'Exstat jocus cujusdam in Hermetem quempiam hujusmodi sequi [sic] pedaliū verbum affectatorem:

Gaudet honorificabilitudinitatibus Hermes,
Consuetudinibus, sollicitudinibus.'

The popularity of the *Adagia* in Shakespeare's time need not here be insisted on. The book promptly found a place in the schools;² and was naturally better known to schoolboys when Shakespeare was one than it is to his commentators to-day.

Among the parallels previously brought forward is a passage in the Prologue to the anonymous *Complaynt of Scotland* (1548 or 1549):³

Ther hes bene diverse translatours ande compilaris in ald tymys, that tuke grite pleseir to contrafait ther vlgare langage, mixand ther purposis vitht oncoutht exquisite termis, drevyn, or rather to say mair formaly, revyn, fra Lating, ande sum of them tuke pleiseir to gar ane vord of ther purpose to be ful of sillabis half ane myle of lyntht, as ther was⁴ ane callit Hermes, quhilk pat in his verkis thir lang tailit vordis: *Conturbabuntur, Constantinopolitani, innumerabilibus, sollicitudinibus*. Ther vas ane vther that vrit in his verkis: *Gaudet honorificabilitudinitatibus*. Al sic termis procedis of fantastiknes ande glorius consaitis. I haf red in ane beuk of ane preceptor that said til his discipulis: *Loquere verbis presentibus, et utere moribus antiquis*: that is to saye, thou sal speik comont langage, ande thou sal lyve eftir the verteous maneirs of antiant men.

¹ Joannes de Janua (De Balbi), *Catholicon* (A. D. 1286). Other parallels are mentioned by Mauntz, by Max Hermann (*Euphorion* 1. 2. 283), by Karl Borinski (*Anglia* 18, N. F. 6. 450), and by Paget Toynbee (*Dante Studies and Researches*, p. 113).

² Foster Watson, *English Grammar Schools to 1660*, p. 425.

³ Ed. by Murray, *EETS.*, Extra Series xvii, p. 16; the passage is connected with Shakespeare by George Stronach, *Notes and Queries* 9. 9. 494.

⁴ Vas? Murray (p. cvii) says the (French) printer used no w.

This evidently bears some relation to the passage just quoted from the *Adagia*; Hermes and the 'vther' are quite as vague to the author of the *Complaynt* as 'quidam' and 'quispiam' to Erasmus. Yet the Scottish account contains matter that is not in the *Adagia*; in particular Erasmus does not specify the long words used by Hermes.

Murray gives good evidence from the language and typography of the *Complaynt* to prove that it was written and printed in France.

Now, in the *Revue du seizième siècle*, VIII (1921), 137, Abel Lefranc has quoted, merely as an analogue to Shakespeare, a passage that must be placed beside that from the *Complaynt*. It is from the Prologue to a translation into French of Cebes' *Tabula* and some Dialogues of Lucian, done by Geofroy Tory.⁵ The portion Lefranc quotes is as follows:

Mais toutesfois j'en doute, que telle forgerie de motz cornuz et exquis fust descendue ou precipitée de la langue latine en la nostre, car il s'en est trouvé et s'en treuve encore aujourd'hui maintz qui pensent avoir fait grosse besoigne s'ilz ont escript en langue latine ung mot estrange et long à outrance. Comme celluy qui dist, et ce neantmoins ingenieusement: *Conturbabuntur constantinopolitani innumerabilibus sollicitudinibus*.⁶ Et l'autre, nommé Hermès, qui mettoit tant sa felicité à escrire en motz longz et exquis qu'il en fut gaudy et batu de son baston, quant ung autre ingenieux homme composa contre luy en motz affectez et longz d'une brasse de syllabe ce distiche qui s'ensuit:

Gaudet honorificabilitudinitatibus Hermes,
Consuetudinibus, sollicitudinibus.

Je dis volontiers ceey en passant affin qu'on ne se attende point trouver motz inusitez en ce vostre petit livre. Je sçay qu'il fut jadis ung homme saige et philosophe qui dist ung jour à son amy: *Loquere verbis presentibus, et utere moribus antiquis*. c' est-à-dire: Parle en langage commun et viz selon bonne meurs anciennes.

⁵ *Table de l'ancien philosophe Cebes, natif de Thèbes, et auditeur Daristote, en laquelle est descrite et paincte la voye de l'homme humain tendant à vertus et parfaicte science*. Paris, 1529. Lefranc promised to publish a full account of this book; if he has done so I am unfortunate in not being able to find it. The title-page, however, as reproduced in the printed Catalogue of the Bibliothèque Nationale, informs us that Tory made his French from a Latin version, and of Tory himself, that he was from Bourges, and that he was a bookseller at Paris, Rue Saint-Jacques.

⁶ Not recognized as a sentence in the *Complaynt*.

This is plainly the original of the passage just quoted from the *Complaynt*; it forms one more link between that book and France; and explains the relation of the Scots passage with Erasmus. In the French the sentence, *Conturbabuntur*, etc., is one thing, and the anecdote about Hermes, taken from Erasmus, is another. The Scottish author has run them together. No doubt any one to whom Tory's book is accessible will find further resemblances between his Prologue and the Prologue of the *Complaynt*.

Neither of these books, I suppose, was known to Shakespeare; the *Adagia*, on the other hand, probably was. But where did Erasmus find the anecdote? And who was Hermes?

Cornell University

JAMES HUTTON

MINISTRELS AND MUSICIANS IN THE REGISTERS OF ST. BOTOLPH ALDGATE

The fact that from 1592 to 1622 a number of actors resided in the London parish of St. Botolph Aldgate,¹ makes the occurrence during the same period of forty-one persons who appear in the Registers as "musition" or "minstrell" of possible importance to the historian of the theatre. Nine, to be sure, are royal musicians² whose connection with plays was presumably confined to

¹ See my paper on "Actors' Names in the Registers of St. Botolph Aldgate," *PMLA*, xli, 91 ff.

² I give in connection with each such fresh information as the Registers provide:

(1) "Humfrey Baach one of the Kinge Chappell" lived in Minories street. He married "Susanne weekes daughter of one John Weekes late of our parish" on 12 Feb. 1617/18, and had children Simon (christened 21 Dec. 1618) and John (christened 5 March 1619, died 2 May 1620).

(2) Lodowicke Baassanoe must have been elderly when he married, in Nov. 1592, Elizabeth Damon (possibly a daughter of William Damon, *vide infra*). He died 18 July 1593, and his posthumous daughter was christened on 2 Sept.

(3) "Robert Benson an Aged-man who was one of the Kings Trumpeters" was buried on 20 Nov. 1619.

(4) William Damon of the Queen's Chapel, famous in the history of Tudor music, lived here from 1584 to his death. His children were christened William (25 April 1585) and John (28 May 1588). His own death is not recorded in the Burialls, though his non-cupative will was filed from the parish on 12 July 1591 (*Archdeaconry Court of London, Act Book* II, 67); but his wife's demise is entered for 14 Aug. 1593.

court productions. But the remaining thirty-two may have served any of the dramatic companies in the neighborhood³ not only as musicians but as players, in a day when "musician and actor were by no means exclusive terms."⁴ This is particularly likely of the seven minstrels in the group, for whom it would be interesting to establish a connection with the Curtain theatre, just to the north-west, which was famous for its jigs.⁵ Always mindful that some of the men whose names are given below may have been mere

Fidlers or some Rogues with staffe and wallet
To sing at doores,⁶

but that others may have had an actor's part in the plays of the period, I present this list of names from the Registers. To save space, I give for each man, not the entire entry, but the date, the designation of the parish clerk, and when it exists, an address:⁷

(5) Joseph Lupo, composer and musician for the violins, lost his wife Lavora on 30 May 1595.

(6) Peter Lupo, his brother, also musician for the violins, had children born to him as follows: Jane (1571), Katheryne (1575), Thomas (1577), Albanus (1579) Elizabeth (1581), Philip (1582) and Fardinandoe (1585), all but the first by his second wife "Katherine Wickes widdow" whom he wedded on 27 Oct. 1575.

(7) Gomer von Osterwerke "one of the Quenes Majesties musicians for the flutes" lost his second wife, Gartrith, on 19 Aug. 1587 and took to himself a third in the person of Marye Parkins on 7 Oct. of the same year. His children were Gomer (christened 2 July 1590), John (christened 22 Aug. 1591) and Joyce (buried 1 Sept. 1588). The musician himself was buried on 27 July 1592 according to an entry which corroborates the Audit Office Record to the effect that he died on 26 July.

(8) Edward Pearce, Gentleman of the Chapel in 1589 and Master of Paul's in 1600, is probably the "Edward Pearce Musition" whose son William was buried on 20 July 1600.

(9) Robert Wroth "one of the Kinges Maiesties Trumpetters" was buried on 12 Aug. 1619.

³ The Theatre in Shoreditch, the Boar's Head in Aldgate High, and the house of "the Prince's Company in Whitechapel;" cf. the Curtain *infra*.

⁴ T. W. Baldwin, *The Organization and Personnel of the Shakespearean Company*, p. 77; cf. also, p. 146. For specific instances in which the same men sustained the two rôles see, *passim*, G. E. Bentley's *Shakespeares Fellows* in *LTLS* for 15 Nov. 1928 and his "Records of Players in the Parish of St. Giles Cripplegate," *PMLA.*, XLIV, 789 ff.

⁵ C. R. Baskervill, *The Elizabethan Jig*, p. 106.

⁶ Wither, *Abuses Stript and Whipt* (1613), Book II, Satire 3.

⁷ I shall be glad to furnish an entry in full to anyone interested.

<i>Name and Address</i>	<i>Year of Entries</i>	<i>Designation</i>
Ashbie,* Roger bull alley (1617) 3 kinge alley (1618)	1617, '18, 1620, '24	Musition (2) Ffidler (2)
Baker, Jasper Rosemarie lane (1616) bull alley (1618)	1615, '16, '18, '19, '21, '24	Musition (6)
Baker, Robert	1596	Ministrell (1)
Barley,* James of Eastsmithfeild	1620	Musition (1) fidler (1)
Batcheller, Thomas	1616	Musition (1)
Bateman, Richard 3 Kinge alley	1612, '13, '14, '15, '17, '19	Musition (5)
Collier, John Beare Alley	1617, 1620	Musition (2) ¹⁰
Coweye, Adam	1606	musition (1)
Crosone, Robert	1604	Trompettar (1)
Daffee, William blew Ancher alley	1618	Drummer (1)
Day, ¹¹ Christopher Hatchet Alley	1612, 1613	Musition (2)
Ellison, Griffin	1618, 1624	Musition (1)
Feilde, ¹² William	1593, '94, '96	musition (1) ministrell (1)
Godfrey, Edward neere houndsditch	1618	Musition (1)
Knott, Thomas	1599	trompettar (1)
Langlie, ¹³ Robert Ali's Langdell	1601	Minstrell (1)

* The orthographic vagaries of the period make it possible that he was related to Edward Ashborne who is listed among the attendants and musicians in the King's Company in 1624 (J. Q. Adams, *The Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert*, pp. 74-5).

* He may have been a connection of William Barley, Stationer, who was brought before the High Commission in 1598 for selling at Cowdray a twopenny book on her Majesty's progress; cf. E. K. Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage*, iv, 65. There was a musician named William Barley who in 1596 published *A new booke of tabliture, shewing howe to play the lute, opharion and bandora*; Pollard-Redgrave (*Short Title Catalogue*, § 1433) cite a unique copy in the British Museum.

¹⁰ He was also "free of the Bricklayers." John Collier may have been the son of John the "silkeworker" who was living in St. Giles Cripplegate in 1567 (cf. *Return of Aliens*, I, 356).

¹¹ Chambers (*op. cit.*, II, 313), gives a Thomas Day of the Chapel in 1601.

¹² Possibly a relative of Nathan, Nathaniel, or Richard Field.

¹³ He may have been kin to Francis Langley, Henslowe's rival at the

<i>Name and Address</i>	<i>Year of Entries</i>	<i>Designation</i>
Linke, Geoffrey	1595, 1598, 1619	minstrell (1)
		Musition (1)
Lowicke, Ralphe	1601	Minstrelle (1)
Marston, ¹⁴ John	1585, 1587, 1593	Musition (1)
Moulde, John	1618	drummer (1)
Newton, ¹⁵ Richard	1593	musition (1)
Olyver, Edward	1593	musition (1)
Row, ¹⁶ Thomas	1605, 1607	musission (2)
Shacklock, ¹⁷ Edward	1617, 1620 ¹⁸	Musition (1)
Red Lion alley		
Shander "mr "	1618	Musition (1)
Simson, ¹⁹ William	1616, 1617	Musition (2) ²⁰
Nightingdale lane		
Spence, Thomas	1602	Muzession (1)
Tatum, William	1596, 1606	minstrell (1) seruante to John Tatam (1) ²¹
Thrum, Penitent ²²	1597	luteplayer (1)
Vause, ²³ Anthonie	1618	Trompetter (1)
Warren, Thomas	1593, '96, '97, '99, 1600	minstrell (5)
White, ²⁴ John	1625	Musition (1)
Wilkinson, ²⁵ Rowland	1600	Minstrell and Cittizen of London (1)

Brookline, Massachusetts

EMMA MARSHALL DENKINGER

Swan; cf. Chambers (*op. cit.*, I, 368; II, 131-133; IV, 36-7), and Baldwin, *op. cit.*, *passim*.

¹⁴ Possibly the same person as "John Merson, servant to Edward Smythe, bugler, borne in Shanne in Burgundye, came into England two yeares paste," who appears in the "Libertas Sancti Martini Lee Graund" according to the "veve taken the sixt daye of Aprill, anno 1583" (*Return of Aliens*, II, 351).

¹⁵ He may have been a connection of John Newton, who belonged to Charles's Men in 1610-1625 (cf. Chambers, *op. cit.*, II, 330).

¹⁶ A Walter Rowe prepared a songbook for the Princess Louise Charlotte of Brandenburg in 1632 (cf. Baskervill, *op. cit.*, 236). William Row, mercer, appears in the Revels Accounts, 1571-1579 (Feuillerat, *Doc. Revels Elis.*, 137, 161, 273, 290).

¹⁷ I have found the name in Professor Moore Smith's transcript of the records of Trinity College Cambridge; there from 1557 to 1562 payments were made to "Sr Shackelocke for his players" (*Malone Society Collections*, II, 2, 159 and 163.).

¹⁸ The second entry has to do with the burial of Elizabeth his widow who is described as one of "Mr. Dowes Pencioners in the Ward." See my note on Robert Dow's benefactions in this parish (*PMLA.*, XLI, 109).

¹⁹ He may have been kin to the family of recusant players which included Christopher, Cuthbert, John, and Richard (*Chambers, op. cit.*, II, 339).

MASSINGER AND THE HOUSE OF PEMBROKE

The connection between the Massinger family and the House of Pembroke has long been known, and has been carefully summarized by Maurice Chelli in his book *Le drame de Massinger*, Paris, 1924, pp. 39-42. There it appears that the dramatist's father, Arthur Massinger, was in the service both of Henry Herbert and, after his death in 1601, of his son, William; that he was a gentleman of Pembroke's retinue and an envoy who at various times was entrusted with commissions of some importance; and finally that he was quite possibly a member of parliament. It has not, however, been noticed, I think, that there are three letters among the manuscripts of the Marquis of Salisbury¹ which refer to Arthur Massinger as a servant of Pembroke. For the sake of completeness I reprint them here.

²⁰ He was also "free of the Barbour-Chiurgions."

²¹ He is so described in the second entry, which has to do with his death. Is John Tatum the same person as John Tatham whom Professor Bentley found living in St. Giles in the Fields in 1639 (*RES.*, vi, 165), and identified with the city poet?

²² However appropriate his surname may have been for a luteplayer, Penitent seems to have borne a strange Christian name for an actor. But cf. Constance and Temperance, the daughters of Thomas Bourne of St. Giles Cripplegate (*PMLA.*, XLIV, 795); and Ruth, Timothy, Simon, and Michael, children of Christopher Goad, another actor of the same parish (*ibid.*, 803).

²³ His wife Anne is described as "a Black-more" and he himself as "of the said Countrey." If he is the same person who appears as "Anthonie Vause, attendant vpon the Spanishe Embassadour" and living in Queenhithe Ward in 1583 (*Return of Aliens*, II, 285), he was the son of Anthony "being a Portingall and a felt-maker," who with his family attended the parish church of Mary Magdalyn (*idem*, III, 382). Our Anthony would naturally have sought other employment following Mendoza's withdrawal from England in January, 1584. He may have found it in the theatres.

²⁴ Possibly related to William White, the property-maker (cf. Feuillerat, *Doc. Revels Eliz.*, 294).

²⁵ The only Wilkinson mentioned by Chambers (*op. cit.*, iv, 261) is John the "colliour" who was in 1549 brought to book because he suffered and maintained "interludes and playes to be made and kept within his dwelling house."

¹ *Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Most Hon. the Marquis of Salisbury, K. G., &c. preserved at Hatfield House, Hertfordshire. Part VIII. Historical Manuscripts Commission, London, 1899, pp. 264, 352, 439.*

The Earl of Pembroke to Sir Robert Cecil.

1598, July 18.—Your kindness deserves better respect from me than that I should by any mine action occasion unto you any inconvenience; therefore, although I am very sensible of the unkindness lately offered unto me by the refusing an honest gentleman whom I did recommend, and in naming another whom I do not like, yet will I proceed for remedy thereof in none other sort than yourself shall allow. Therefore for that matter I have written to the Lords. Massinger hath the letters to deliver, and the copy wherewith first to acquaint you, unto whom I refer him to be directed. My heartiest thanks for your good furtherance of my request for Mr. Edward Penruddoke.—Wilton, 18 July, 1598.

The Earl of Pembroke to Sir Robert Cecil.

1598, Sept. 18.—It pleased your father to promise me his furtherance to her Majesty in some causes concerning her Highness's service at the Council in the Marches of Wales. Although to the general loss of the whole realm, and to mine exceeding grief, God hath taken him from us, yet my comfort is that as you inherit his virtues, so towards myself you will continue his friendship. My businesses I refer to my servant Massinger his report, which I pray you credit, for neither can I without your too great trouble, nor without some inconvenience to myself, commit them to my letters.—Wilton, 18th September, 1598.

The Earl of Pembroke to Sir Robert Cecil.

1598, Nov. 15.—I send by my servant Massinger the indentures of the names of the 200 soldiers now sent out of this county of Wilts for service in Ireland. Although my care has been great to perform what was required therein, yet I had rather Sir Nicholas Parker (who by chance passing by this way has seen them) should report the sufficiency of their persons and arms than I to make it known unto you by my letters. Massinger has also a copy of the return now sent up for sheriffs in the 12 shires of Wales, to be delivered to you. I pray you prefer Thomas Lewes of Ruperry for sheriff of Glamorganshire, and Mathew Herbert for sheriff of Merionethshire. They are most worthy this place which I seek for them.—Wilton, 15 Nov., 1598.

It is plain that Arthur Massinger was a gentleman of some importance in the Pembroke household, and that his dramatist son had good reason to expect that his call for patronage, in the dedication of *The Bondman*, would not go unanswered.

ROBERT H. BALL

Princeton University

MASSINGER'S *THE PICTURE*, BANDELLO, AND
HUNGARY

The relationship of Massinger's *The Picture* to its source has already been thoroughly investigated, but some significant aspects of its plot have not been touched upon by either Köppel,¹ or his follower, Merle.² Massinger called this drama a "*true Hungarian History*"³ and indeed, originally, the plot borrowed from Bandello through Painter's *Palace of Pleasure* had a historically genuine Hungarian background. The king at whose court the Bohemian gentleman, hero of the *novella*, acquired fame and fortune, is a great historic character: King Matthew I of Hungary (1458-1490) was one of the most distinguished princes of the fifteenth century. His efforts to create a center of Renaissance culture on the shores of the Danube were celebrated by scores of the foremost Italian humanists. After his death, his wife, Beatrice of Aragon, daughter of Ferdinand, king of Naples, retired to Naples, where she personally met Bandello, took kindly interest in him, and helped him in hours of distress.⁴ He repaid her kindness by repeated encomiums and by placing her and her husband in leading rôles in the *novella* in question (I, 21).

Thus, the king and queen were truly historic characters in the *novella*. Although Bandello asserted that his stories were "not fables, but true stories, unless he was misled by him who told them" to him,⁵ according to Reinhold Koehler's⁶ and Gaston Paris's⁷ investigations, it is manifest that this time Bandello mingled poetry and reality. He borrowed the entire anecdote with all its details from an episode of *Perceforest*, a French epic of the fourteenth century, and in addition to the French version, the story is known in

¹ *Quellen-Studien zu den Dramen G. Chapmans, Ph. Massingers u. J. Fords*, Strassburg, 1897.

² *Massingers "The Picture" und Painter*, II, 28, Halle a. S., 1905.

³ *The Plays of Ph. M. with Notes, Critical and Explanatory*, by William Gifford, London, 1853, p. 252.

⁴ Fr. Picco, *Quaranta Novelle Scelte di Matteo Bandello*, Sonzogno, Milano, n. d. (1911), p. 7.

⁵ Dedicatory to II, 21, and elsewhere also.

⁶ "Zu der Erzählung Adams von Cobsam 'The Wrights Chaste Wife,'" *Jahrbuch f. rom. u. engl. Lit.*, 1867, pp. 44 ff.

⁷ *Romania*, V, 23 (1894), pp. 102 ff., and especially p. 107, n. 2.

at least four variants, in Turkish, Persian, and English, and in the *Gesta Romanorum*. Accordingly, Francesco Picco's dating of Bandello's *novella* ought to be modified a trifle: Picco conjectures that it was composed between 1506 and 1512.⁸ Since Queen Beatrice died in 1508, it seems doubtful whether Bandello would have assigned her a rôle in a fictitious story while she lived; I would suggest that the *novella* was not composed before 1508.

Although besides the royal couple there was no Hungarian element at all in the *novella*, the prestige of King Matthew's name was great enough for readers to take Bandello's word for its truthfulness. Matthew's humanist biographers, Bonfini and Galeotto, were widely read in the sixteenth century; it is significant that an Italian humanist, Pietro Bizzari, who spent some time in England also, published an epigram on Matthew's death as late as 1565.⁹ When Massinger enlarged Bandello's anecdote with a secondary plot dealing with a lovelorn king and an all too ambitious queen, he could not possibly use the name of Matthew or Beatrice, with whom he and his public were thoroughly familiar. Instead, he selected another historic name from the long list of kings of Hungary, that of Ladislas. Hungary had had five kings by this name, but it is certain that Massinger could not think of Matthew's immediate predecessor, Ladislas V, as Resi Gielen suggests,¹⁰ for this Ladislas died young and a bachelor; besides, the character assigned to Massinger's hero does not fit any historic king of Hungary. Honoria, the Queen, is an entirely fictitious person, for there has never been an Hungarian queen by this name. All in all, we must suppose that Massinger's aim was to eliminate as much as possible of the genuine historic elements of the plot; he kept merely the vague Turkish wars of Hungary which had been going on since the fourteenth century.

To conclude, Massinger based the subtitle of *The Picture* on the assumption that Bandello's *novello* was an authentic Hungarian story. By changing the historic characters of the plot, however, he unwittingly forfeited the only Hungarian element of his drama. There remained only the vague Turkish wars as a really Hungarian

⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 52, n.

⁹ *Poematum Libri II*, Aldus, Venetiis, 1565, p. 148 b.

¹⁰ *Untersuchungen zur Namengebung bei Beaumont, Fletcher und Massinger*, Münster, 1929.

motive in *The Picture*, and the passages in the drama censorious of court and courtiers do not concern Hungary but most probably relate to conditions in England about 1629.¹¹

ARPAD STEINER

Hunter College

NEW VERSES BY JOHN WEBSTER

To the few "occasional" pieces of verse written by John Webster, the dramatist, may be added another example which has not been noticed by Dyce or Hazlitt, or by Mr. F. L. Lucas in his excellent edition of the *Complete Works of John Webster* (1927). This is a set of seven descriptive or "emblematical" verses on an engraving preserved in the Print Department of the British Museum (call-number 1849-3-15-15) bearing the title, "THE PROGENIE OF THE MOST RENOWNED PRINCE IAMES KING OF GREAT BRITAIN FRANCE AND IRELAND," and having the publisher's note: "Are to be sould at the Vnicorne in Cornehill neare the Exchange by Will: Riddiard."

The print, which measures $11\frac{3}{8} \times 18\frac{1}{2}$ inches, is described in the B. M. *Catalogue of Engraved British Portraits*¹ as

A memorial plate, representing James I seated on throne, holding sceptre and skull, with Queen Anne and Prince Henry on either side of him, their hands on skulls. On l. of the print stand Charles I and his Queen with their living children Charles, Mary and James . . . and on r. Elizabeth, titular Queen of Bohemia, with the King and their ten children.

At the foot of the throne are seated two deceased children—probably Margaret (b. 24 Dec., 1598) and Mary (b. Ap., 1905), both of whom died in infancy.² On the left wall is represented an angel unrolling a scroll on which is depicted the infant son of Charles I, who died shortly after birth (13 May, 1629). On the right, beneath a balcony, is hung a framed genealogical table that

¹¹ Thus Chelli's contention, according to which Massinger in his pseudo-historical dramas merely amplified the themes inherent in the plots themselves, is not borne out by *The Picture*. Cf. M. Chelli, *Le Drame de Massinger*, Paris, 1924, p. 54.

¹ By Freeman O'Donohue and Henry M. Hake, v (1922), 32.

² A third child also died early, "Duik Robert" (b. Ap. or May, 1601). The *Catalogue* is mistaken in calling them children of Charles I.

traces the ancestry of James beginning with Edward IV. Skulls are also represented with the figures of the King of Bohemia (d. 29 Nov., 1632) and of his eldest son, Frederick Henry (d. 17 Jan., 1629).

The *Catalogue* notes that the print

is evidently the second state (issued after 1633 [the birth-year of James II]) of a plate originally published in James's lifetime. The figures of Henrietta Maria and her children are additions; also the death's heads assigned to King James, to the King of Bohemia and to the latter's eldest son.³

It may be suggested, however, that the verses descriptive of Charles (given below) imply his betrothal to Henrietta Maria and that she was included in the original issue of the print. If this be true, the engraving may be dated between December, 1624, when the marriage treaty was ratified and the death of the king on 27 March, 1625. This would make the verses one of the latest productions of the dramatist.

Seven of the principal characters portrayed are given letters which refer to the similarly-lettered descriptive verses below. The latter occupy the whole lower portion of the engraving; that is, each stanza is placed end-long to each other in the order, from right to left, G F, B, A, C, D, E, each being separated from the other by a bracket. The last stanza on the left, i. e., E, bears beneath it the inscription: "Hæc composuit Ioannes Webster."

The verses are as follows.

A [*King James*]

Tu decus omne tuis

Ars vtinam mores, animūq; effingere posset;
pulchrior in terris, nulla Tabella foret.
*Could Art, his gifts of mind, express as well,
no Picture in the World, should this excell.*

B [*Queen Anne*]

Mors sceptrā, ligonibus æquat.

*Queene Ann, resignes her Scepter vnto fate,
and yet in death, you may obserue her State,
whch outshines, all the Jewels of the Crowne,
shee left behind her, a most cleare renowne;*

³ In this case, the figures of the two children of the King of Bohemia,

C [*Prince Henry*]

Vno Auulsu non deficit Alter.

*Prince Henry (to our generall sorrow) die'd,
eare, his beloued Sister was a bride;
Never did a great Spright, earlier shoot
but the Prime blossomes, seldome become fruit*

D [*Frederick, King of Bohemia*]

Virescit vulnere virtus

*Great in thy birth, & greater in thy choice
but absolutly greatest, in the voice
proclaimes thee constant, vnder fortun's spight;
thus enuy, death, and hell thou putst to flight.*

E [*Elizabeth, Titular Queen of Bohemia*]

Phœnix/Vnica semper auis

*One Phœnix at a Tyme, and this is shee;
sweet, as her funerall nest of Spicery
o may your father, frō your fruitfull wombe,
plant vniversall peace in christendome.*

F [*Prince Charles*]

Diis Genita: & magnos progēiture Deos

*Happy Coniunction; wch to men doth show,
So blest an Influence, such blisse below;
The same as when in their high spears about
The God of war do neet and Queene of Loue*

G [*Two deceased children of King James*]

Hev propere nimis coronandæ

*Hæc cum parca tulit duo dulcia pignora regis
flebilis agnouit crimen et erubuit*

*When Fate before their due matured tyme
Pulld these two branches frō their royall stem
The Fates themselues confest their heedles crime
and in acknowledgment did blush for shame*

BERNARD M. WAGNER

Cambridge, Massachusetts

Henrietta (b. July, 1626) and Philip (b. Sept., 1627), would also be additions.

THE COPY FOR *THE CARELESS LOVERS*

The quarto of Edward Ravenscroft's *The Careless Lovers*¹ contains a number of stage directions that differ from any I have observed in plays of that period.² These directions, which must have been inserted by the prompter, deal with (1) properties needed for the various settings of Acts IV and V, (2) properties to be brought on the stage, (3) off-stage business, and (4) the calling of certain characters in time to take their cues. These notations are found throughout the play and typographically they resemble the ordinary stage directions. They generally occur in pairs, the preliminary direction preceding the second by an average of 20 speeches or 43 lines. Thus on p. 58,

{ *Call Lovel,*
 { *Careless.*

is followed 21 speeches, or 40 lines, later by "*Enter Lovel and Careless.*"

The structure of *The Careless Lovers* changes abruptly at the end of Act III, and act and scene headings likewise change. Acts I, II, and III—the first portion composed by Ravenscroft (see below)—consist of one scene each. Each act is numbered and each ends with a couplet, but none has the location of the action

¹ *The Careless Lovers: A Comedy Acted at the Duke's Theatre. Written by Edward Ravenscroft, Gent. London, Printed for William Cademan, at the Popes Head in the Lower Walk in the New Exchange, 1673.*

² Similar stage directions may be found in a few plays of an earlier period, notably in Massinger's *City Madam* (1658) and in several plays first printed in the 1657 folio of Beaumont and Fletcher; and their occurrence has been noted by V. E. Albright, *The Shakesperian Stage*, 106-07, P. H. Farrier, *Critical Edition of The City Madam* (U. of Va. diss. unpublished), 13-14, and Bullen's Variorum ed. of Beaumont and Fletcher, II, 105-06. Farrier and Bullen surmise that the plays in question were printed from prompt copies, but do not prove the truth of their assumption by citing the evidence to be found in Massinger's *Believe as You List*, of which we have the autograph MS with the autograph license of Henry Herbert. No one, I think, has suggested that the actual prompt copies were sold to the publishers at this time because they could not be used in the theatres, or that the scarcity of such stage directions as we are now dealing with in earlier and later quartos may be evidence that when the theatres were open, prompt copies were not normally permitted to leave the possession of the actors.

indicated, and no settings are described, though Act III is an interior scene. Acts IV and V, also numbered and ending with couplets (that of Act IV is printed as prose), consist of three scenes each, and though these scenes do not have formal headings and numbers, many of them have properties listed, as for instance IV, [iii]:

Tables, Chairs } Enter Mrs. Breeder, Clappam,
Candles, Bottles } Drawer in Tavern.

or V, [iii]:

Hall-Table and } Enter Lovel, Jacinta, the Scene changes,
Candles, 4 Chaires. } and a Room in Muchworth's House.

A second group of directions reminds the property man to have needed articles at hand. On p. 39 we find:

{ A Bottle of Sack,
and Glass ready
for Beatrice.

and two pages later Beatrice makes her entrance. On p. 64, "[Beat. on the Beir ready." warns the prompter to line up the funeral procession described as follows on p. 66:

Toby in the habit of a Bearer, 4 Bearers with a Coffin on a Beare; 4 Maids in white, bearing up the 4 corners of the Sheet; they walk around the Stage, set down the Corps as to rest themselves; attended with some few followers.

A direction on p. 33,

Enter Beatrice.
[Bring Napkins and stop their Mouths.],

is peculiar in lacking a preparatory direction and in naming properties and stage business that are not alluded to in the dialogue.

Stage directions that indicate sound effects and other off-stage business are met with in many plays, but few of them are preceded as in *The Careless Lovers* by a "warning." The direction on p. 15 is a good example:

{ Ready to shut
the Boul.

The business takes place on p. 16, "[Shut the Boul." "[Knock ready." on page 40 is followed by a double direction:

Knocking at the Door.] [Knocking within.

Several of the directions quoted above would serve as a warning to the actors as well as to the property man or prompter. Others have only one purpose, to get an actor ready for his entrance, as on p. 58, for instance, "[*Call Hilaria*," prepares for the entrance on p. 60. Although five of the principal characters are thus warned, the prompter is not always reminded to call them. And sometimes his chief interest seems to be in the minor characters, as on p. 62:

{ *Call Careless, Musick,*
{ *Breed. Clap.*

This is printed in the midst of a conversation between Careless and Hilaria and shows that the prompter was concerned with getting *Musick* and two other minor actors ready for their entrance 44 lines later.

Most of the stage directions are in content just what one expects to find, but even these have a typographical interest, for they are now on the left side of the page, now on the right, and again in the center; and occasionally entrance and exits are omitted. Sometimes the directions are wholly in italics, sometimes all but the proper names are italicized, and sometimes only the proper names. In many cases "entrances," usually printed in the center of the page, are preceded and followed by a space, but often one space or the other is omitted, as if the manuscript had been revised and the original stage direction crowded by the revision.

Now Ravenscroft has told us something of the history of the play and the rest³ may be pieced out or surmised. He says in "The Epistle to the Reader":

. . . It was written at the Desire of the Young Men of the *Stage*, and given them for a *Lenten-Play*; they ask't it not above a Week before *Shrove-Tuesday*: In three dayes time, the Three first Acts were Made, Transcrib'd, and given them to write out in Parts—The Two last Acts took me up just so much time: one Week compleated it.

Since Easter fell on April 2, 1673, the play must have been written

³ In 1694 Ravenscroft reworked the play and incorporated portions of Massinger's *A New Way to Pay Old Debts*, calling the product *The Canterbury Guests; or, A Bargain Broken*. This plagiarism has long been overlooked, though Genest noted it, II, 57-58.

in March. By November 24 it had been entered⁴ in the *Term Catalogue* and before the end of the year it was in print.

Examination of the stage directions, taken in conjunction with Ravenscroft's explicit statement, leads me to the belief that in this case, at least, a Restoration play was printed directly from the prompt copy. The nature of many of the stage directions, the irregularity with which directions are located on the page, and the inconsistency with which they are spelled and punctuated indicate that the compositor worked with the fair copy mentioned by Ravenscroft, on which the prompter had noted in helter-skelter fashion whatever was necessary to running off a performance. Furthermore, the compositor was faithful to his copy. He did not attempt to make the stage directions consistent in form and punctuation or to eliminate the unusual ones.

One proof was run off and corrected, for we find a list of errata on p. 77. This makes numerous trifling corrections (but fails to correct the numbering of pp. 25-32, and even perpetuates the error) and catches the compositor in one misreading of the copy. On pp. 60-61 is a short passage of four unimportant speeches followed by "*Enter Hilaria*." Someone marked the passage for deletion and inserted another "*Enter Hilaria*" at the beginning of the cut. The compositor included the "cut" and both "entrances." To correct this, the proof-reader closed the list of errata with: "p. 53 [really p. 60], l. 29. dele *Bet. Sir we are still &c.*" The play seems to have had no other editing. If there had been any opportunity to make corrections, Ravenscroft, who had already seen one play through the press, or anyone in authority at the playhouse, would have removed from the proofs the stage directions which give *The Careless Lovers* its bibliographical interest.

JAMES G. McMANAWAY

Baltimore, Maryland

⁴ Here it has an alternate title: "The Careless Lovers, or The Conceited Travellers."

REVIEWS

Hamlet 1603. By GIOVANNI RAMELLO. Torino: Fratelli Bocca, 1930. Pp. vii + 293.

A volume of nearly three hundred pages devoted to a minute analysis of the First Quarto of *Hamlet* cannot fail to be of prime importance to those interested in the problem of the "Bad Quartos." Later critics will be able to make use of this book even if they lack the elementary knowledge of Italian which would enable them to read the simple and straightforward comment; for much of Ramello's work consists in the textual comparisons which he has made, and these are of course quoted from the English text.

The author announces that he purposes to apply a rigorously inductive method to the examination of the texts in order to clarify the muddled criticisms which have hitherto been made. He then classifies the irregularities of Q_1 and concludes that a large part of it must be spurious and due to the inexpertness or ignorance of the compiler. As a basis of comparison the text of Q_2 is taken, supplemented by the Folio; for Ramello regards Q_2 as set from Shakespeare's autograph copy, which he thinks was given to the printer when the play was entered on S. R. in 1602, a transcript of it serving as the playhouse copy and undergoing various changes between 1602 and 1623.

More than 100 pages are given to the citing of passages from Q_1 with the corresponding passages from Q_2 and a running commentary on the kinds of errors shown in Q_1 . These include passages which do not make good sense, metrical irregularities, grammatical and stylistic anomalies, and dramatic inconsistencies. The author concludes that all the divergencies in Q_1 of whatever sort involve the existence of the play as represented by Q_2 . Except for the substitution of the names of Polonius and Reynaldo for Corambis and Montano, which do not "render necessary the slightest modification of the text," we may regard it as "established that Shakespeare has given us just one version of his masterpiece," and that "the problem of the genesis of *Hamlet* does not exist any longer."

While it seems fairly clear from the argument up to this point that Q_1 is at every stage derivative from Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, it does not follow from any considerations that Ramello has set before us that there was no revision of the drama after the time when the "compiler" heard it on the stage. The rearrangement of the scenes by which Hamlet's "To be or not to be" soliloquy was shifted, the scene of Horatio and the Queen, the changed attitude of the Queen, and other smaller differences in Q_1 might all con-

ceivably be due to the "compiler"; but it does not in the least follow that Shakespeare's play, when it served as the "text-base" for Q_1 , was without these features. Ramello observes that "the compiler has returned to the narrative of Belleforest" for some of these particulars, but will not admit that this very fact argues against his position. He is on safer grounds when he remarks that as the publication of Q_1 was apparently due to the great success of *Hamlet* on the stage, there would be no point in revising the work. The question as to whether or not Shakespeare revised his *Hamlet* is left just about where it was, and "the problem of the genesis of *Hamlet*" still exists.

A more interesting and more original discussion follows in the chapter on "Unitary origin of the spurious elements." The author concludes that the regular verses are no better and no worse than the irregular, that many irregular verses have no trace of corruption, that confusion and inconsistency often appear in regular verse although in the most severely mutilated scenes the irregular verse predominates, and that the compiler "was accustomed to scatter irregular verse through that which is regular." The phraseology of both the regular and irregular verse is marked by a superfluity of exclamations, repetitions, and grammatical forms rare in Shakespeare. Noting an obvious parallel in two passages, one of which is a corruption of Shakespeare and the other an addition, Ramello decides that the "corrupter" and the "reviser" are the same.

Whether the pirate had a confederate or did the whole job himself is not a matter of great consequence. If one thief proves sufficient, nothing is gained by insisting upon two. But the positiveness of Ramello in announcing his conclusions tempts one to remark that here again the conclusion is not legitimately drawn from the facts presented. If, as the present reviewer is forced to believe, the "reviser" was a different man from the "corrupter," that does not mean that the signs of his hand would not appear where the "corrupter" was most obviously at work. His task was to supplement the "corrupter's" report throughout the entire play. The parallel cited occurs in two lines of verse which were both obviously written by the "reviser," though in the first instance he was patching the "corrupter's" report. With his facility in writing blank verse the "reviser" would never have set down the speeches of Marcellus line by line as he had learned them and then have put in absurdly irregular lines the perfectly scannable verse which was spoken by some other character on the stage with him. Where we have a characteristic that is really distinctive, like the "lest that" which occurs five times and, as Ramello notes, is of course not to be found in Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, we find that all five instances occur in the regular verse of the "reviser." But the accuracy and care with which the Italian critic has listed the

extraneous interjections, the repetition of phrases, and the un-Shakespearean grammatical forms in Q_1 will assist English students to study the play more carefully than some of them have hitherto done.

It is natural if not inevitable that anyone who made so detailed a comparison of Q_1 with the authentic text would find that the pirate must have been the actor who took the part of Marcellus. Some recent essays, which we know Ramello had not seen, since his bibliography was compiled before they appeared, would have saved him from the mistake of giving this actor also the rôle of Voltimand, whose long speech is a transcript and not a memorial reproduction; from repeating Widgery's error of selecting the First Player (instead of the Second); and from the impossible conjecture that the First Gravedigger might also have been played by the actor-thief.

The list of errors which may be charged to the printer and more especially the list of Q_1 readings which agree with either Q_2 or F_1 against the authority of the other, will be found useful for reference. The book concludes with copious extracts from the English critics with such comments upon them as could easily be conjectured from the constructive portion of the book. There is an Appendix on *Der Bestrafte Brudermord*, which is treated in exactly the same manner that Q_1 was treated, with exactly the same conclusions reached: that it was derived by "reporting" from the play as preserved in Q_2 ; that all its inconsistencies are ironed out by a collation with the true text; that the parallels with Kyd presuppose no *Ur-Hamlet*, but are accidental, or explainable on other grounds, or derived from readings of Q_2 . There can be no doubt that Ramello's book is indispensable for those who intend hereafter to consider the Q_1 problem; and it is equally certain that there is something still to say about that problem in spite of the tone of finality which the latest investigator (like some others before him) has assumed.

HENRY DAVID GRAY

Stanford University

The Doctrine of the English Gentleman in the Sixteenth Century.

By RUTH KELSO. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1929. Pp. 288. \$2.50.

Students who consider the ideals of an age important for understanding its literature, as well as those who prefer to project literature upon a background of social history, will find Miss Kelso's book especially important. It begins with Italian, French, and English theories and definitions of nobility, gentility, and virtue, and of the gentleman. Miss Kelso deduces certain general

conclusions. As changing conditions deprived the noble of his prerogative as a warrior, he sought an outlet in other fields. And these fields were for Englishmen civil rather than military. Hence Elyot's *Boke of the Governour* is addressed, not to the knight, but to his sixteenth-century descendant, the gentleman. In England, certainly, no tradition has from the sixteenth century been more notable than that which posits, for the person well born, service to the state in fields not necessarily military. But although such was the ideal, practice and ideals did not always agree. Arms continued to hold, by convention, an important place in the gentleman's life. Other occupations came to be winked at. Bars were lowered until the gentleman might without great derogation engage even in certain trades. The change from feudal and chivalric ideals was largely complete by the beginning of the seventeenth century.

If, as Elyot, Mulcaster, and others maintained, the person of good birth was more likely to benefit the state than one of base origin, it was only sensible that he should receive special training. Miss Kelso sketches the change from the knightly to the Renaissance ideal of education, indicating differences between Italian and English aims: the former tending toward perfection in the individual as an end in itself, the latter insisting upon the usefulness to society of training up what Elyot termed "governors." The difference in aim led to differences in method, the most salient feature of English theories of education being that experience of the world was favored over book learning. Miss Kelso would have done well to stress the further point that, beginning with Elyot, education aimed chiefly at character rather than mere intellectual attainments—an aim consonant with English fondness for principles from moral philosophy.

Of the gentleman's moral code, including courtesy, Miss Kelso has a good deal to say, particularly of the relation of Renaissance notions to Christian and chivalric and pagan. Into matters of etiquette she goes but slightly. There is an interesting attempt to relate the gentleman's code of honor to the duel. And as no account of gentle nurture would be complete which failed to deal with physical exercise and recreations, there is a brief sketch of sixteenth-century field sports and indoor games.

Not least in importance are the 109 pages in which Miss Kelso gives us the first real bibliography of this subject, including works from Continental countries. Though it claims to be only a working list, it provides an excellent basis for future studies. An index provides a useful key to bibliography and text. Miss Kelso has read widely and assimilated the materials thoroughly. This admirable book should provoke further interest in the relation to society of the aristocrat and the ideals of his class.

W. LEE USTICK

Baltimore, Maryland

Chateaubriand and Virgil. By LOUIS HASTINGS NAYLOR. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1930. Pp. xv + 212. (The Johns Hopkins Studies in Romance Literatures and Languages.)

Professor Naylor's *Chateaubriand and Virgil* is the development of a dissertation presented at the Johns Hopkins University in 1923, one of a series of studies devoted to Chateaubriand by pupils of Professor Chinard. Few investigations could be of greater educative value to their authors than these studies of great writers, although they only could bring confirmation of well-known facts and serve chiefly to assemble materials for a critical edition of Chateaubriand's works. Publication, in such cases, should follow as a reward for the accomplishment of an arduous task. This has been made possible for Naylor in the bi-millesimal anniversary year of Virgil's birth, with the happy result that he has now been able to incorporate in his book the pertinent results of the findings of Miss Smead and Miss Miller, Pierre Moreau, C. R. Hart, and Blaise Briod. It follows that *Chateaubriand and Virgil* may be recommended as the broadest study of what can be termed the principal literary sources of Chateaubriand.

This volume is well planned and fully documented except at the beginning and end. Naylor's Introduction is an attempt "to present the concept of Virgil in France between 1790 and 1830." However, the affirmations: "Among all the romantic poets . . . there was current a tradition regarding Virgil" or "Virgil wrote that his hero wept. Aeneas was, therefore, according to the Romanticists, a Romantic hero" (pp. xiii, xiv) do not carry much conviction, unsupported by any evidence at all. The reviewer also confesses complete ignorance of the concept of "le Virgile poitrinaire" (put in quotes by Naylor without explanation) the last words in the book. "Virgil in the life of Chateaubriand," the first chapter, explains the romanticist's familiarity with the poet, and points out how often Chateaubriand's fondness for Virgil was due to the similarities which he discovered in their lives as set forth in his autobiographical writings, thus creating in France a new image of Virgil as a melancholy and tender poet, after 1802. "Chateaubriand as a critic of Virgil," chapter two, continues the discussion of melancholy, and presents Chateaubriand's views upon the originality of Virgil in his imitations of Homer (as a screen against accusations of plagiarism). Here too are set forth, largely from *le Génie du christianisme*, its author's "statements concerning the religion of the Romans as a source of literary inspiration." René did not always understand Virgil, as in *le Génie*, where he interprets the picture of the Sibyl's frenzy as an indication of melancholy: "*Les tours négatifs sont particuliers à*

Virgile, et l'on peut remarquer, en général, qu'ils sont fort multipliés chez les écrivains d'un génie mélancolique" (p. 103).

"He (Chateaubriand) is never so content as when the comparison in his work forms a mosaic of which the stones are taken from many passages." His borrowings from Virgil, found in *les Natchez*, in *Atala*, *René*, and *le Génie*, as well as in *les Martyrs*, are analyzed in the three remaining chapters, showing a preference for the *Aeneid* and the *Georgics* but much familiarity with the *Eclogues*. These borrowings group themselves under five heads: (1) the representation of female characters; (2) the themes of travel and life in exile; (3) combats; (4) descriptions of nature; (5) and comparisons of human beings with the lower animals. In *les Martyrs*, the Virgilian supernatural machinery is drawn upon frequently to provide a setting for the tale.

Naylor shows excellent taste in his enjoyment of Chateaubriand's landscapes in the Virgilian manner. His own style is generally free from the pitfall of gallicisms (*récit*, p. 149, *procédés littéraires*, p. 187). Two indices, one from Virgilian source-material to Chateaubriand's works, the other from the French text to Virgil, add further proof of Naylor's ingenuity and capacity for taking pains, if more were needed than excellent typography.

WILLIAM LEONARD SCHWARTZ

Stanford University

Le Roman Belge contemporain: Charles de Coster, Camille Lemonnier, Georges Eekhoud, Eugène Demolder, Georges Virrès.

Par BENJAMIN MATHER WOODBRIDGE. Préface de Maurice Wilmotte. Bruxelles: La Renaissance du Livre, 1930. xxi + 214 pages.

Un livre qui doit être salué comme nous offrant enfin quelque chose de concret sur les écrivains belges contemporains dont on parle beaucoup et dont on sait si peu. Il est étonnant que M. Woodbridge ait été le premier qui ait songé à profiter de son séjour en Belgique (profitant de la libéralité de la "Commission for Relief in Belgium, Educational Foundation") pour examiner de près le pays et écrire un livre comme celui-ci. C'est tout à son éloge. Les Belges l'ont senti, et le vétéran des lettres belges, M. Maurice Wilmotte, a tourné en sa faveur une préface dont M. Woodbridge n'a pas à se plaindre.

L'auteur ne donne pas une histoire de la littérature belge, mais choisit quelques représentants auxquels dans sa table des matières il affixe un adjectif—qui, cependant, à lire le livre même, ne paraît

pas toujours très caractéristique, ou du moins pourrait bien induire en erreur. Le roman de Ch. de Coster n'est "historique" que comme cadre, mais prétend bien parler pour les contemporains; le roman de Lemonnier est bien "mystique," mais c'est le mysticisme du naturalisme le moins chaste (il a passé trois fois devant le tribunal pour accusation de pornographie); pour Virrès, l'auteur a senti lui-même que "roman catholique" n'irait pas et il écrit "romancier catholique" car, en effet, Virrès comme les autres est avant tout un réaliste convaincu et ne glisse au catholicisme qu'incidemment; c. à. d. que s'il est bien, lui, catholique, les romans ne le sont pas spécialement.

Mais laissons cela. Le but du livre était de montrer en ces écrivains la tentative de créer une littérature qui soit bien foncièrement belge avant tout. En lisant M. Woodbridge, le lecteur verra jusqu'où ils ont réussi. En somme, l'impression qui demeure est qu'ils ont créé une littérature de "vigueur brutale et [de] crue observation" selon l'expression de M. Wilmotte. Ils ont fait en littérature ce que les fameux peintres flamands avaient fait en art, et les formules de Taine semblent s'appliquer décidément bien fort à la Belgique. Chacun cependant exprime avec des nuances ce réalisme violent et gras: de Coster en ressuscitant un type populaire, Till Ulenspiegel, qui est pour les Belges ce que Pantagruel est pour les Français, Falstaff pour les Anglais, Don Quichotte pour les Espagnols: Lemonnier, le plus foncièrement belge, en mettant son honneur à ne reculer devant aucune truculence ou indécence: Demolder en alliant son goût du sensuel avec un très remarquable sens de la plus délicate féerie (peut-être le plus original); Virrès, en y mettant à l'occasion du catholicisme de prolétaire. Quant à Eekhoud, il est le moins clair psychologiquement; on ne voit point, même après avoir lu le volume de M. Woodbridge, comment se concilient dans ce cerveau, ces fanatiques plaidoyers pour les êtres en marge de la civilisation, et cette aristocratie de sentiment qui fait qu'il ne veut que les regarder mais refuse leur manière de vivre et de penser. Que faire de cela: "Tu rêves donc la révolution, l'anarchie.—Oh, que non! . . . Je ne trouve les gueux adorables que comme tels. . . . S'ils se révoltent, j'entends que ce soit isolément, chacun pour soi, sans qu'il entre dans leurs transgressions un esprit de revendications sociales" (136)? En cet être fougueux, qui veut être à la fois "sociologue humanitaire et artiste," on entrevoit par moments un frénétique, presque un déséquilibré.

M. Woodbridge est discret, dit M. Wilmotte;—oui, il l'est peut-être même un peu trop. Il est difficile en le lisant de ne pas penser souvent à deux grands écrivains, Verhaeren et Maeterlinck qui sont belges aussi, et qui ont tous les traits des auteurs présentés. Comment se fait-il qu'ils aient, eux, acquis en quelque sorte droit de

cité dans la littérature française de France, tandis qu'on ne peut en dire autant de ceux étudiés par M. Woodbridge? Sans doute, ils ne sont pas romanciers, et comme tels ils étaient hors du cadre du livre; mais nous avons comme une idée que, même s'ils avaient choisi le roman comme moyen d'expression, ils auraient percé aussi. Quel est donc ce quelque chose qu'ont ces deux et que les autres n'ont pas? Il serait intéressant de le rechercher.

ALBERT SCHINZ

University of Pennsylvania

Thomas Chatterton, the Marvelous Boy. To which is added The Exhibition, a Personal Satire. By ESTHER PARKER ELLINGER. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1930. Pp. 75. \$2.00.

In all the warring schools of contemporary psychology there are as yet no concepts which give unity to the young science. Faced by this confusion of tongues, most critics choose psychoanalysis and lend a credulous ear to some of its most fantastic formulations. So far as I know only one literary critic, Louis Peter de Vries, has done full justice to all the contemporary schools of psychology and to their parentage.¹

Most literary psychoanalysts have been Freudians. But Esther Parker Ellinger has turned to Freud's rebellious pupil, Adler, to read the riddle of Chatterton, the marvelous boy. While Adler, with his "inferiority complex," is just as restricted in his outlook as Freud, with his Protean conception of "sex," Miss Ellinger has certainly chosen the formula which rescues Chatterton from the pruderies and the vague mutterings of "insanity" which have beclouded the reputation of that amazing young poet from his day to this. Her diagnosis is completely convincing.

There is, I think, only one flaw in her work. She points out quite properly that we have no right to make light of Chatterton's aesthetic achievement because he was a neurotic. But she exonerates Chatterton of deceit because he was a neurotic. We must either blend cause and effect with *all* values, aesthetic as well as ethical, or we must maintain that the descriptive and appreciative points of view are mutually exclusive. We cannot use science to allow us to praise the beauties of Chatterton and to forbid us to blame his moral aberrations. It should be added, however, as Miss Ellinger's finely objective biographical sketch shows, that Chatter-

¹ *The Nature of Poetic Literature*, Seattle, University of Washington Press, 1930.

ton was, in the main, a youth of lofty moral insight and practice and that his venial sins would give no great offense to anyone who is not hopelessly vinegar-visaged.

Nevertheless this little volume is an admirable example of what is needed in a day when most academic literary critics are too concerned with antiquarianism and most journalistic literary critics are irresponsible impressionists. Moreover, the volume contains a carefully edited text of an important but hitherto inaccessible satire, *The Exhibition*. Finally, the careful sifting of the work of earlier critics is noteworthy for its catholicity and discrimination.

HERBERT ELLSWORTH CORY

University of Washington

German Plays of the Nineteenth Century. By T. M. CAMPBELL.
New York: F. C. Crofts & Co., 1930. Pp. 437. \$4.00.

This volume, including twelve dramas from eight dramatists, can give our students a fairly comprehensive idea of the development of the German drama in the nineteenth century, from the rise of romanticism to the rise of naturalism:

Tieck: *Der gestiefelte Kater*; Werner: *Der vierundzwanzigste Februar*; Kleist: *Der zerbrochene Krug*, *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg*; Grillparzer: *Sappho*, *König Ottokars Glück und Ende*; Hebel: *Maria Magdalene*, *Herodes und Mariamne*, *Agnes Bernauer*; Ludwig: *Der Erbförster*; Anzengruber: *Das vierte Gebot*; Hauptmann: *Einsame Menschen*.

While there are bound to be subjective differences as to the inclusion of this or the omission of that drama—personally I regret only that instead of *Sappho* Mr. Campbell did not include *Des Meeres und der Liebe Wellen* or maybe *Medea*—on the whole, the selection has been made judiciously. The notes are brief and to the point, qualities much to be desired. The Introduction is a scholarly and useful piece of work, well written, concise, enlightening. It is all that such introductions should be: it gives the student the necessary information, and the teacher will read it with pleasure and profit. I wish to take issue on a few points:

(1) I doubt whether Tieck deserves to be called "a great poet" (p. 4). Novalis, Hölderlin, Eichendorff essentially were, but Tieck is only a near poet.

(2) Instead of saying that "Wieland's enthusiasm for Robert Guiskard was unbounded" (p. 6), why not quote Wieland's words since they sum up Kleist's dramatic endeavor?

(3) I feel, too, that Mr. Campbell is driving a good point too

far when he says of Grillparzer's heroes that "they collapse in the consciousness of their own impotence" (p. 12) and of his women "that they are of the traditional kind, not concerned in the least about guarding their rights as individuals, but only with captivating and holding the men they love" (p. 14). Is this true of Medea or even of Hero?

(4) And last: "It was the misfortune of the Romantic drama that the leaders of the movement had no liking for Schiller." It would not have affected the salvation of the Romantic drama one iota if they had loved Schiller. They did not learn dramatic art from Sophocles and Shakspeare, and would not have done so from Schiller. Why? Such things are not learned. Witness Gottfried Keller's long and unsuccessful struggle with the drama. By and large the romantic movement was lyric and epic, and not dramatic.

The proof-reading has been done with care. A few errors can easily be corrected by any reader, *e. g.* Danton's Tod (page 14), Weisze (page 3 but Weissenfels on page 6), S. Vischer (instead of Fischer, 385), Monaledschi (Monaldeschi, 430). The special introductions to the various authors and the individual plays seem to have been added as an after thought; they are dry and perfunctory. They might well have been left out.

FRIEDRICH BRUNS

University of Wisconsin

Voltaire and the English Deists. By NORMAN L. TORREY. Yale Romanic Studies, Vol. I. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1930. Pp. x + 224. \$2.50.

Although Voltaire's indebtedness to England has long been studied with great care and much light thrown on many aspects of it, the specific problem of the relation of Voltaire to the English Deists has been the subject usually of mere assumption or guess work. The explanation is not difficult: Deism as a philosophical school is dead and uninteresting; and, one congratulated oneself, Voltaire's obligations in that direction were obvious enough not to require detailed investigation. Thus we find Churton Collins, who was by no means a careless worker, writing as follows in what has been among the standard discussions of the subject: "Most probably Voltaire owed infinitely more to Bolingbroke than to all the other English deists put together, but how carefully he had followed the course of this controversy [of Woolston in 1727 and later] is obvious from innumerable passages in his subsequent writings" (*Voltaire, Montesquieu and Rousseau in England*, London,

1908, pp. 61-62). In the study before us, Professor Torrey sharply contradicts both these conclusions. He finds excellent reasons for deciding that the supposed influence of Bolingbroke is a "treacherous starting point" (p. 5), and that "whether or not Bolingbroke's philosophy, or metaphysics, was worth borrowing from, Voltaire paid almost no attention to it" (p. 148). And as for Woolston's attack on the miracles, Professor Torrey affirms with precision that Woolston's ideas appear first in Voltaire in the *Sermon des cinquante* in 1762. In fact, the general conclusion of this study is that Voltaire "was little interested in the critical deists as such during his stay in England" (p. 35), and that his intensive study of them belongs to his old age at Ferney, when in his vigorous polemics and propaganda he made liberal, and often unscrupulous, use of both their ideas and their reputations.

Professor Torrey has reached something like finality in his treatment of his subject. First he has carefully read the Deists and compared their texts with that of Voltaire. But he has had the good fortune further to test all his conclusions by the evidence found in Voltaire's library in Leningrad. A very elaborate system of paper markers, explained by Professor Torrey, served not only Voltaire in the composition of his works, but Professor Torrey in turn in tracing his sources. Evidence of such objective nature is of course seldom available to the student of sources and influences, and the general conclusions reached in this excellent study are not likely to be disturbed.

LOUIS I. BREDVOLD

University of Michigan

Abbé Prévost, *The Adventures of a Man of Quality*, Translated with an Introduction. By MYSIE E. ROBERTSON. New York: The Dial Press, 1930. Pp. 208. \$4.00.

Who would have expected Prévost's *Mémoires et Avantures d'un Homme de qualité* (1728-1731) to come again to light in a popular edition after a two-hundred-year interval? Rather pale they seem now and yet not devoid of a certain gentle interest, particularly as Dr. Robertson, already favorably known for her critical edition of Volume V of these *Mémoires et Avantures*, has chosen for her translation this same volume, which reproduces in fictional form some of Prévost's most vivid impressions of England and English literature. Thus it is Prévost, the apostle of cosmopolitanism, a genial and smilingly benevolent forerunner of the ironic Voltaire, who appears in these pages and no one interested in a contemporary picture of eighteenth-century England can afford to neglect the

Abbé's smooth-flowing and rather quaint narrative with its occasional concrete details appearing unexpectedly in the midst of more conventional passages.

The editor has furnished an excellent Introduction, well-written, authentic, and full of the facts of the author's life at this period. There are also such footnotes as the text occasionally needs and an extensive and very useful bibliography dealing particularly with Anglo-French relations during the early eighteenth century.

Ohio State University

GEORGE R. HAVENS

BRIEF MENTION

The Student's Milton. Edited by FRANK A. PATTERSON. New York: F. S. Crofts, 1930. Pp. x + 1090 + 41. \$5.00. This is a remarkable volume, since it contains all of Milton's poetry together with the translations of the Latin, Greek, and Italian poems by Columbia professors, and nearly all the prose works—including the *Christian Doctrine*. Yet the type is large, and as there is but one column of verse on a page, the poetry has a very attractive appearance. It is seldom that so much is offered in a form so pleasing at a price so reasonable.

R. D. H.

Der Begriff 'Romance' in der mitttelenglischen und frühneueinglischen Literatur (Anglistische Forschungen, Heft 68). By REINALD HOOPS. Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1929. Pp. viii + 98. RM. 6. When one reflects on the lively interest in the medieval romances which has so long obtained, it is surprising that Dr. Hoops should be the first to undertake a thorough-going study of the semantics of the word "romance" as exhibited in ME and early NE literary documents. But the matter has now been competently dealt with and in an interesting though scientific fashion. After an account of the etymology < *rōmānice*, adv., and of the various ME forms and spellings, the meanings of 'romance' are carefully analysed (French, Romanic; a story in general; narrative poem; as the equivalent of 'source'; and as the designation of a specific poem). A study of the form and contents of the ME romances follows, also a discussion of the modes of presentation, oral delivery, and the like. A special section is devoted to the use of 'romance' from 1500-1650. An appendix offers the reader a convenient index of

illustrative passages utilized, while scarcely less useful is a list of works read in which 'romance' does not occur.

On p. 43 Dr. Hoops quotes from the *NED*. a passage from John Evelyn's Letter to Sir Richard Browne, dated London, December 6, 1647. The entire passage, not accessible to the author, runs as follows:

That evening I made a visit to my Lord of 36, and my character goes among all mine acquaintance for the civilest traveller that ever returned. *For I was expected all ribbon, feather, and romanzo*, which has turned much to my account, though better spoken from another (Bray's 1854 ed., III, 5).

'Romanzo' is rendered by the *NED*. 'romantic style'; this will do, but 'mannered,' 'affected' is, judging from the context, rather closer to the mark.

What might have been little more than a glorified *NED*. article proves to be an illuminating study of one aspect of a most important medieval literary genre.

F. P. MAGOUN, JR.

Anglo-Irish Literature, 1200-1582. By ST. JOHN D. SEYMOUR. Cambridge, England: University Press, 1929. Pp. 170. The purpose of this little volume is to give 'the ordinary reader a general account of a literature the existence of which he may never have suspected'; more precisely Mr. Seymour has brought together the gist of what is generally known (or knowable) of the non-Celtic literature produced in Ireland from the Anglo-French *Dermot and the Earl* to Richard Stanihurst. The so-called Kildare poems loom large, but literature in Latin and in Anglo-French (Jofroi de Watreford, and others) is not essentially subordinated to English writings. The author's contribution lies in assembling this material upon which he comments and which he illustrates by extensive quotation, now in the original, now translated, now modernized. The ordinary run of bibliographical aids are drawn upon. As a piece of Hiberno-Latin several pages (pp. 41 ff.) are devoted to the famous witchcraft trial of Alice Kyteler (see G. L. Kittredge, *Witchcraft in Old and New England*, p. 122 *et passim*).

The tone and style of the work is semi-popular; it is a useful survey of a small but interesting subject.

F. P. MAGOUN, JR.

Lancelot in English Literature: his Rôle and Character (Diss., Catholic Univ. of America). By AUGUST J. APP. Washington, D. C.: Catholic University, 1929. Pp. iii + 261. \$1.20. The author sets out to collect all 'literary Lancelot material in English literature' and has probably succeeded in gathering into his net

a large majority of references. Of the 232 pages of text, pp. 1-23 are devoted to Lancelot previous to his appearance in English literature, pp. 24-51 to Lancelot in English literature before Malory; the remaining 181 pages constitute by far the most useful and valuable part of the work. It is by this latter portion of the book that Dr. App's work should be judged; this is his main concern and it is here that he has been essentially successful. *Lancelot in English Literature* does on a large scale with a single Arthurian figure what G. H. Maynadier in *The Arthur of the English Poets* did a quarter of century ago for Arthurian romance in general.

The early pages of Dr. App's work are not authoritative nor do they pretend to be so; yet the analyses of ME romances in which Lancelot figures are useful even when the accompanying comment may strike one as superficial. T. P. Cross and W. A. Nitze's *Lancelot and Guinevere* (Chicago, 1930) would have been invaluable to him here. For some detailed criticisms of the discussion of the medieval Lancelot see R. S. Loomis, *Speculum*, v (1930), 104, 105.

Similar studies of other Arthurian figures will be of value in indicating the later development and popularity of Arthurian romance.

F. P. MAGOUN, JR.

Harvard University

Materials for the Life of Shakespeare. Compiled by PIERCE BUTLER. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1930. Pp. x + 200. \$2.00. This book reprints in modernized form some of the documents on which rests our knowledge of Shakespeare's life. It also reprints much that has no direct bearing on the subject, at the expense of omitting important items that may be found in, for example, even so compact a handbook as Professor Brooke's *Shakespeare of Stratford*. To his "materials" the compiler furnishes chatty introductions presumably aimed at younger readers. He points out, for example, that we are fortunate in having the exact date of the poet's baptism, and inquires, "You who read this, can you prove . . . when or where you were born or baptized? Many Americans had the experience during the Great War of finding how very, very hard it was to establish their own identity." There is little discrimination in the handling of the various degrees of opinion, hearsay, tradition, and documentary evidence (the yarn concerning D'Avenant's paternity is disposed of by citing, first, the inn-keeper's desire to be buried near his wife, and, second, a "wholesome laugh" by Sir Walter Scott), while the writer's familiarity with current criticism may be measured by the footnote to Rowe's conjecture that *The Merchant of Venice* was "designed

tragically": "Rowe's criticism seems to our day the sound one." Nor can this volume be completely relied on for undisputed fact. Thus (p. 3) *Lucrece* is misdated.

H. S.

The Classics in Translation. By F. SEYMOUR SMITH. Charles Scribner's Sons: London and New York, 1930. 307 pp. \$3.00. This is an annotated guide to the best English translations of the Greek and Roman classics. It should be very useful to librarians, and to other people who are likely to be asked about such things. A few corrections and additions may be suggested. P. 212: the six elegies of 'Cornelius Gallus' are now ascribed to a much later poet Maximianus. P. 221: the Loeb Library translator of the Odes and Epodes of Horace was Charles E. Bennett, not Stephen Bennett. P. 227: the statement about Dr. Johnson's paraphrase of two of the Satires of Juvenal needs revision. P. 253: Alexander Barclay's "three eclogues of the miseries and manners of the Count and Countess" looks at first sight like a merry misprint for "the miseries of Courts and Courtiers," but an unfortunate comment suggests that the compiler has here confused two Latin treatises by the same author, *De Curialium Miseriis* and *De Duobus Amantibus*. P. 254: K. C. Bailey's translation of Pliny's chapters on chemical subjects (1929) is called the first translation of any part of the 'Natural History' since the Bohn edition of 1855, though an English version of the chapters on the history of art (1896) is mentioned on the very next page. P. 89 has Crinagorus, for Crinagoras. Pp. 170, 173, 258: the printer insists on the title *Res Gestae Divi Augustae*. Inasmuch as the Latin section includes mediaeval and modern authors, it might have mentioned the famous Eclogues of Baptista Mantuanus, with the translations by George Turbervile (1567) and Thomas Harvey (1656). Also, Alexander Barclay's *Mirroure of Good Manners*, paraphrased from Mancinus (c. 1520), Barnabe Googe's *Zodiacke of Life*, from Palingenius (1565), and John Rooke's *Select Translations from the Works of Sannazarius, H. Grotius, Bapt. Amaltheus, etc.* (1726). P. 236 should have mentioned H. W. Garrod's skilful version of the Second Book of Manilius (Oxford, 1911); p. 199, F. B. Calvert's translation of the *De Oratore* of Cicero (Edinburgh, 1870). One further suggestion is *Sancti Augustini Vita scripta a Possidio Episcopo*, translated by H. T. Weiskotten (Princeton, 1919).

W. P. MUSTARD

The Johns Hopkins University
